A History of Russia:
From Peter the Great to Gorbachev
Part I

Professor Mark D. Steinberg

THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

Mark D. Steinberg, Ph.D.

Professor of History, Director of the Russian and East European Center, University of Illinois

Mark Steinberg completed his undergraduate work at the University of California at Santa Cruz in 1978 and received his Ph.D. in European history at the University of California at Berkeley in 1987. He taught Russian and European history at the University of Oregon (1987), Harvard University (1987–1989), and Yale University (1989–1996) before joining the faculty at the University of Illinois, at its main campus in Urbana-Champaign, in 1996. Since 1998, Professor Steinberg has also been the Director of the Russian and East European Center at Illinois, an interdisciplinary program designated by the Department of Education as a national resource center.

Professor Steinberg has received many awards for his teaching, including the Sarai Ribicoff Prize for Teaching at Yale University (1993) and, at Illinois, the George and Gladys Queen Excellence in History Teaching Award (1998 and 2002) and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (2002). For his work as a scholar, he has received numerous prestigious fellowships, including from the International Research and Exchanges Board, the Social Science Research Council, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Smithsonian Institution, the Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In 2001, the University of Illinois gave him one of its highest honors and named him a University Scholar.

Professor Steinberg has published many articles, delivered numerous papers at national and international conferences, given public lectures throughout the country, and served on several national professional committees and editorial boards. He specializes in the cultural, intellectual, and social history of Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His first book, published in 1992, was a study of the relations among employers, managers, and workers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, entitled *Moral Communities*. In 1994, Professor Steinberg co-edited *Cultures in Flux*, an influential collection of essays on Russian lower-class cultures. In 1995, he published, together with a Russian archivist, *The Fall of the Romanovs*, which examines the fate of the tsar and his family during the revolution and includes translations of documents from then recently opened Russian archives. In 2001, Professor Steinberg published *Voices of Revolution, 1917*, a study and collection of translated documents exploring the revolution through contemporary letters and other writings by ordinary Russians. His most recent book, *Proletarian Imagination*, published in 2002, explores poetry and other writings by lower-class Russians in the years before and after 1917, focusing on ideas about self, modern times, and the sacred. He is currently working on a collection of essays on religion in Russia, a revised textbook on Russian history, and a study of St. Petersburg in the late 1800s and early 1900s.

Professor Steinberg is a native of San Francisco and is married to Jane Hedges, an editor and translator. Further information can be found at his Web site: http://www.history.uiuc.edu/steinb/index.htm.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Table of Contents

A History of Russia: from Peter the Great to Gorbachev Part I

Professor Biography i
Course Scope 1
Lecture One Understanding the Russian Past 2
Lecture Two The Russia of Peter the Great's Childhood 4
Lecture Three Peter the Great's Revolution 7
Lecture Four The Age of Empresses—Catherine the Great 10
Lecture Five Social Rebellion—The Pugachev Uprising 13
Lecture Six Moral Rebellion—Nikolai Novikov 16
Lecture Seven Alexander I—Imagining Reform 19
Lecture Eight The Decembrist Revolution 22
Lecture Nine Nicholas I—Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality 25
Lecture Ten Alexander Pushkin, Russia's National Poet 27
Lecture Eleven The Birth of the Intelligentsia 30
Lecture Twelve Westernizers—Vissarion Belinskii 33
Timeline 35
Glossary 39

Please refer to Part II for the biographical notes and Part III for the annotated bibliography.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

A History of Russia: From Peter the Great to Gorbachev

Scope:

After a discussion of background issues (geography, multi-ethnicity, the problem of backwardness, Europeanization), the course begins with politics and culture on the eve of Peter the Great's efforts to transform his country, then looks at Peter and his reforms. Next, women's rule in eighteenth-century Russia is examined, with a particular focus on the reigns of Elizabeth (Peter the Great's daughter) and Catherine the Great. Turning toward society, two additional lectures on the eighteenth century follow: on the Pugachev uprising and the growing critique of autocratic despotism by educated Russians, especially the publisher and writer Nikolai Novikov. Lecture Seven begins the nineteenth century by returning to a focus on the state and the monarch: Paul I and especially Alexander I, who seriously discussed possible reform. We also look at the Decembrist rebellion, in which educated nobles took arms against the state to bring about social and political reform. Next, we consider Nicholas I and the ideas about power and order that inspired the Russian state at that time. Returning the gaze to society, the course then offers lectures on different intellectuals' visions of change: the "national poet" Alexander Pushkin (whom we consider also for what his image as a symbol of the Russian nation tells us) and the full-fledged emergence of the "intelligentsia" in the 1830s and 1840s. Particular attention is paid to their ideas about Russia, the West, and the meanings of freedom.

Lecture Thirteen begins the history of the Great Reforms under Alexander II, which sought to create a modern society in Russia though dramatic reform. We then examine dissident trends and the individuals associated with them: nihilism (including terrorism), populism, Marxism (including the emergence of Bolshevism). For a different voice, we look at the famous writer Lev Tolstoy, especially his life and his arguments about morality and conscience. Returning our gaze to official Russia, we highlight the lives, personalities, and outlooks of the last two tsars, Alexander III and his son Nicholas II. We then consider a decisive event in the reign of Nicholas: the strikes, demonstrations, and public demands that the tsarist government accept civil rights and democratic rule in Russia in 1905. To see Russia's changes in larger perspective, we look at peasant life and culture in the late 1800s and early 1900s, life in the changing cities (especially for workers and the middle class) from the industrialization drive of the 1890s to the eve of World War I, and at aspects of what might be called *fin-de-siècle* culture: decadence in everyday life and in the arts, cultural iconoclasm, and the religious renaissance.

Lecture Twenty-Five examines the Russian experience in World War I and the coming of revolution. It is followed with an examination of the Russian experience in the key months from the fall of the tsarist government in February to the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in October, then by a lecture on the Bolsheviks during their first year in power. The story of the Civil War comes next, followed by a discussion of the debates in the 1920s in the Soviet Union over how to overcome Russia's backwardness and build socialism. Next, we look at Joseph Stalin's biography and political personality, the era of radical industrialization and social transformation that he launched at the end of the 1920s, and the contradictory political, social, and cultural life of the 1930s (including the Great Terror). We turn then to the Soviet experience in World War II and to politics and the experiences of Soviet people during the decades after the war and before Gorbachev's reforms. Continuing the theme of exploring dissent, we look at some of the various forms of alienation from, and resistance to, the Soviet system during the years before Gorbachev came to power (both everyday forms and open dissidence). Finally, we look at Mikhail Gorbachev's recognition of the many problems of the system and his efforts to make Communism work though a policy of reform. The final lecture concludes with a consideration of the situation left in the wake of the collapse of Communism.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture One
Understanding the Russian Past

Scope: This first lecture introduces the overall scope and plan of the course. The lecture explains the approach of the course, including its focus on human experience, ideas, and values and especially on the lives and thoughts of individuals, both notable and ordinary. Next, the lecture considers why the history of Russia is significant for us, and fascinating, both as a story of events that had great impact on modern world history and as a story of human experience. Finally, it outlines the chronological scope of the course, reviews the types of individuals to be considered (ranging from political rulers to ordinary men and women), and highlights the themes that weave these stories together (especially power and imagination).

Outline

I. This introductory lecture has three main purposes.
- **A.** First, I want to introduce the approach to the Russian past I am using in these lectures, especially my focus on individuals and ideas.
- **B.** Second, I would like to offer some thoughts about why it is important to study the history of Russia.
- **C.** Third, I would like to provide an outline of this course.

II. Historians *narrate* the past.
- **A.** The past itself is immense, chaotic, and fragmentary.
- **B.** History tries to create some order and logic.
- **C.** These lectures focus, not only on what happened in the past and why, but on how people acted in the past and, especially, how they made sense of their lives.

III. Russian history is important and compelling.
- **A.** Russia's sheer size makes it important to understand. Note that this is a modern greatness, because as late as the early sixteenth century, Russia was still a relatively small nation.
- **B.** By the nineteenth century, Russia was a vast multinational empire that covered one-sixth of the earth's land surface. It was also a great political and cultural force in the world.
  1. In the early sixteenth century, the country was still politically fragmented and economically and culturally undeveloped.
  2. Even many Russians were concerned that Russia was far behind Europe.
  3. But, by the nineteenth century, Russia was clearly a European power and culture.
  4. Travelers to Russia in the nineteenth century may have been appalled by the dictatorial power of the Russian monarchy and dismayed at the poverty of the majority of the people, but they also recognized that educated Russians were as sophisticated and European as themselves.
- **C.** Russia's modern history is also important and compelling as a human story, though it is an often-contradictory story.
  1. It is a story of people's efforts to discern life's fundamental meaning, as well as a story of their uncertainty and confusion.
  2. It is a story of people's efforts to create a society built on principles of right and justice, as well as a story of evil and injustice.
  3. It is a story about human imagination and creativity, as well as a story of great tragedy.
  4. Yet Russia is not "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." Although a dense and complex tale, it is compelling because we *can* understand it.

IV. Before we begin, we should consider some of the people to be examined and some of themes and ideas that link these human stories together.
- **A.** First, the time frame of this course is *modern* Russia, from the childhood of Peter I ("the Great") in the late seventeenth century to the rule of Mikhail Gorbachev at the end of the Communist era.
- **B.** Certain types of people are the focus of attention:

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. Political rulers (tsars, emperors, Communist Party leaders) are central figures in this story.
2. No less important are political rebels.
3. These lectures also introduce creative writers, poets, and artists.
4. Finally, we will explore the lives and thoughts of relatively ordinary people.

C. One of the major themes is power.
1. We will explore how political rulers used state power and justified their authority.
2. We also look at the critical arguments made by peasant rebels, intellectuals, and dissidents.

D. Another major theme is imagination.
1. Throughout Russian history, we see varied individuals and groups imagining and, often, trying to construct a different life—politically, socially, culturally, morally—from the one they were leading.
2. No less important is the reverse side of this spirit of imagination: widespread doubt and pessimism and the tragic failure of many of these visions.

E. Another theme is Russia and the West.
1. Since Peter the Great's time, Russians have struggled with their relationship to the West.
2. The West represented both a competing economic and political force (and model) and an influential source of ideas and culture.

F. Happiness, and the pursuit of happiness, is yet another theme: From rulers to revolutionaries, Russians have often spoken of happiness as what they most sought for themselves and Russia.

G. Morality and ethics form another theme.
1. The idea of an ethical society often motivated rulers who embarked on courses of reform.
2. Critics of the state used the idea of an ethical society as a mirror to show the corruption and evil of the status quo.

H. A related theme is spirituality.
1. The influence of the Russian Orthodox Church has long been widespread in Russian life.
2. In addition, diverse individuals have believed that the material life alone would not ensure happiness or morality in the world.

I. Finally, people's everyday lives are a central part of this historical account.

Essential Reading:

Gregory Freeze, ed., *Russia: A History* (Oxford, 1997), chapter 1.

Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime,* chapters 1–2.

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (Oxford, 2000), chapters 1–14.

Supplementary Reading:

Daniel Kaiser and Gary Marker, eds., *Reinterpreting Russian History* (York, 1994), chapters 1–8.

Questions to Consider

1. Why have outside observers of Russia so often emphasized its "backwardness," even savagery, and/or its inscrutability, as in Churchill's famous description of Russia as "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma"?
2. How does looking not only at the actions of rulers but also at their values and ideals and at the experiences and attitudes of ordinary people or intellectuals change how we understand the history of a country?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Two
The Russia of Peter the Great's Childhood

Scope: This lecture explores Russian politics and culture on the eve of Peter the Great's efforts to transform his country. In light of the image of Peter the Great as single-handedly bringing Russia into Western civilization, this lecture explores changes already underway by the end of the seventeenth century. We look at efforts to modernize state and law, at the ideology of Russian state power (especially the competing ideas of secular and sacred rulership), and at the Western sources of these ideas. The lecture then considers the Westernization of everyday Russian life, including the growing presence of foreigners in Russia and cultural changes in the lives of individual Russians. Finally, the lecture describes the influence of all these changes on Peter the Great's childhood.

Outline

I. We shall first examine a story that borders on myth: that Peter the Great initiated modernization and Westernization in Russia.

- **A.** According to this story, Russia was a backward, Asiatic nation before Peter came to the throne at the end of the seventeenth century.
- **B.** After Peter, it is often said, Russia was fully on the path toward becoming a modern Western nation.
- **C.** Sometimes these stories about Peter's revolutionary transformation of Russia were quite elaborate.
  - **1.** Leading Russians often declared that Peter was the "sculptor" who shaped modern Russia or even a god.
  - **2.** In the nineteenth century—a more scientific age—Peter was seen as a historical great man who had the power to alter the destiny of his country.
- **D.** These claims hold some truth.
  - **1.** But these images of Peter also expressed a certain idealism about where Russia *should go*, which led to a darkening of the images of where Russia had come *from.*
  - **2.** Russia, in reality, was not "a blank sheet of paper" when Peter came to power. Already when Peter was born in 1672, the country was changing in many ways.

II. In the political sphere, Russian rulers and their officials tried to create the structures of a modern (if authoritarian) monarchical state.

- **A.** First, they tried to increase bureaucratic centralization, though the tsar remained powerful.
  - **1.** This meant reforming the existing system, in which personal rule over the state by the monarch was combined with personal rule over local society by noblemen.
  - **2.** Instead, the country was increasingly governed by bureaucratic offices and officials based in Moscow.
- **B.** No less important was the ongoing effort in the seventeenth century to establish orderly laws and structures, to systematize government and especially law. This culminated in one of the most important events of the seventeenth century: the enacting of a new comprehensive law code (*ulozhenie*) in 1649.
- **C.** To more fully understand Russian politics on the eve of Peter's rule, we need to explore how people understood politics and power in the late seventeenth century.
- **D.** One place to look is at the symbols of power, at self-representations of authority.
  - **1.** When Peter the Great's father, tsar Aleksei Romanov, came to the throne in 1645, he wore barmy—ornate brocade shoulder coverings, "The Life-Giving Cross," and the Crown of Monomakh, and he carried the orb and scepter, the latter crowned with a double-headed eagle.
  - **2.** The message of these symbols is clear: They emphasize the ruler's sacred authority and that his power was rooted in the whole of Christian history.

III. These seventeenth-century ideas about the nature and legitimacy of the Russian monarchy, in particular, certain key ideas, would long remain influential.

- **A.** The tsar understood his power to be that of an "autocrat" and saw the system as an autocracy.
- **B.** Helping to define this notion were two basic ideas:

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. First, the ruler as a powerful secular force, as forceful, dynamic, even aggressive, though for the good of the nation—a *groznyi tsar* (awesome and mighty).
2. Second, the ruler as sacred and loving (as a Christian monarch)—as a *tishaishii tsar* ("gentle," pious, saintly).

C. Both ideas have their roots other than in Russia, of course.
1. Ancient Rome was the referent for the mighty and secular ideal.
2. Byzantine rulers were the referent for the pious and Christian ideal.

D. The relation between these two ideals was not simple.
1. The two aspects were unified in that the sacred roots of power made the ruler all the more powerful, and the ruler's power made him a more effective vicar of God.
2. But there was also tension: The sacred sources of the tsar's power potentially compromised his secular absolutism, for such a ruler must govern in accordance with the will of God and for the good of others.

IV. We now look beyond the halls of state power into the world of society and culture, where the connections with the larger world were especially pronounced.

A. We should not forget that Western influences in Russia had a long history.
1. A large proportion of the ruling elites were not purely Slavic.
2. Once the Russian state accepted Christianity, the cultural influences of Byzantium became strong.
3. As early as the fifteenth century, Russian rulers were eager to establish to the world that they were European rulers.

B. By the late seventeenth century, Western influence was becoming much more widespread and substantive.
1. Intellectual life was changing.
2. Huge numbers of foreigners came to Muscovy to live. By the time of tsar Aleksei (1645–1676), many foreigners had become permanent residents of Russia, and a special foreign settlement (*nemetskaia sloboda*) had been established in Moscow.

C. All these changes affected the everyday lives of many Russians.
1. Many of Russia's leading noblemen dressed in Western clothes, did not wear beards, had portraits painted, ate Western foods, and smoked. One such aristocrat was Vasilii Liutkin.
2. For the Russian elite, things were changing even before Peter the Great's reforms, especially a growing sense that Russia was a part of Europe.

V. Peter was born in 1672 into this vital, changing environment.

A. Tsar Aleksei's death in 1676 first brought Peter's half-brother Fyodor to the throne and then, in 1682, Peter and his half-brother Ivan to power, though real control was in the hands of the regent Sophia.

B. Peter's childhood was a remarkably free one (especially during his years of virtual exile from the Kremlin between the ages of ten and seventeen).
1. Bored by life away from the Kremlin, Peter spent much time with soldiers and foreigners.
2. These two groups would remain important parts of his life and his rule.

C. Peter loved the soldier's life so much that he formed his own private play regiment when he was eleven.

D. Peter's interest in technical matters (especially building boats) led him to the foreign settlement in Moscow, and he also made friends with less than well-born Russians.

E. He learned much about the world and about technical achievements from these foreigners.
1. His contact with them shaped his choice of Western dress and appearance.
2. Peter's association with foreigners spurred him to study math and science, but these associates also taught him how to drink heavily and enjoy the charms of foreign women.

F. Eventually, he would apply all of these energies and ideas to remaking Russia.

Essential Reading:

George Freeze, ed., *Russia: A History* (Oxford, 1997), chapters 2–3.

Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime*, chapters 3–4.

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (Oxford, 2000), chapters 15–19.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Michael Cherniavsky, "Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Medieval Political Theory," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20 (1959): 459–476.

Daniel Kaiser and Gary Marker, eds., *Reinterpreting Russian History* (York, 1994), chapters 9–13.

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in the Russian Monarch* (Princeton, 1995), vol. 1, chapter 1.

Questions to Consider:

1. What were the achievements and limitations in Russia's turn to the West before Peter I's reign?
2. How did the Russian tsars traditionally think about their power? How do we reconcile their absolutism and even brutality with their professions of religious faith and desire to rule as Christian monarchs?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Three
Peter the Great's Revolution

Scope: This lecture looks at the reign of the ruler many say did more to create modern Russia than any other: Peter I ("the Great"). The lecture begins with Peter's childhood and the period of his minority as tsar, a key period of contradictory possibilities in Russian history and one in which Peter developed his major interests and orientation to the world. The lecture then examines Peter's personality: his energy and love of work but also his crudeness and cruelty. We then survey Peter's major reforms, especially reform of government and mandated changes in society and culture. The lecture concludes by examining the vision of progress that motivated reform, especially the meaning of the West for Peter. Particular attention is paid to his reforms of cultural life and the creation of St. Petersburg as a new modern capital.

Outline

I. Peter's first years were a time of tumult, contradiction, and possibility.

- **A.** At the age of ten, Peter became co-tsar of Russia (as Peter I).
  - **1.** He ruled together with his half-brother Ivan V.
  - **2.** Real power was in the hands of the regent Sophia (Peter's elder half-sister).
- **B.** In 1689, when Peter was seventeen, Sophia was deposed when she tried to seize full control of the throne.
- **C.** A traditionalist reaction set in almost immediately.
  - **1.** Traditional religiosity was strongly encouraged.
  - **2.** All foreigners came under suspicion.
- **D.** Still, the forces of Westernization were alive and strong.
  - **1.** During this period, Peter spent more time than ever in the foreign settlement, and he insisted that those associated with him dress and behave in a Western manner.
  - **2.** Symbolically, Peter made it clear where he stood in the culture wars of the time: through his dress, his recreations, and his use of rituals.
- **E.** In many ways, the two tsars, Peter and Ivan, visibly symbolized the two choices Russia faced at the end of the seventeenth century.
  - **1.** The "pious" (if also not especially bright) Ivan V was to be seen walking about in his heavy, brocaded Muscovite robes.
  - **2.** Peter, by contrast, was dressed in European clothing and was seen riding and sailing, dashing between shipyard and military parade, and making it clear that he considered Russia's traditional ways backward.
- **F.** After the death of his mother in 1694, Peter decided it was time to take control and to act in dramatic and public ways on his inclinations and values.

II. To understand these inclinations and values, it is necessary to examine Peter's personality.

- **A.** Peter was a physically huge (6 feet, 7 inches tall) and energetic man.
  - **1.** Like no Russian ruler before him, Peter was profoundly optimistic, positive, and active.
  - **2.** This was also a political idea: Peter believed that government had a positive, active role to play in a nation's life.
- **B.** Not unrelated to his high level of energy, Peter was obsessed with physical work.
  - **1.** He loved making things: model boats, furniture, crockery. He also considered himself a good surgeon and dentist.
  - **2.** More significantly, as a young man, he traveled to Europe, where he learned a variety of industrial skills and techniques.
- **C.** At the same time, Peter's public personality was marked by a great deal of personal crudeness.
  - **1.** He drank prodigiously (and insisted others do the same).
  - **2.** He reveled in noise, buffoonery, and horseplay, perhaps the most famous example being the rather bizarre institution known as the "All-Mad, All-Jesting, All-Drunken Assembly."

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. Many interpretations have been offered to explain the Drunken Assembly, the most common being an attack on the Church by a modernizer and his supporters.
4. Equally important, however, was the social function of the Assembly: it facilitated camaraderie and bonding among Peter's associates.

D. Although Peter could be quite compassionate, he was often violent and cruel.
1. He carried a club with which he occasionally beat nobles, friends, and other members of his court when he felt this was needed.
2. More politically significant, Peter brutally suppressed dissent and was constantly involved in wars.

III. Almost from the moment Peter came into real power, he showed himself to be an exceptionally energetic ruler.

A. During his reign, there was continual territorial expansion through war.

B. Peter sought to rationalize and centralize government and administration, creating new governing bodies and a new political police, reorganizing the empire geographically, and putting the Church under state control.

C. Parallel to these administrative reforms were changes meant to transform society, including a single "Table of Ranks," new civic organizations, industrial enterprises, a new tax system, and the structures of a Western intellectual life.

IV. But what was Peter's vision of progress?

A. In part, Peter's idea was technical, involving the regularization of laws and of the social structure.

B. Yet, despite all his reforms, Peter was ruling in the Russian tradition.
1. He believed in and insisted on his all-powerful might as a ruler (his role as a *groznyi tsar*).
2. This is clearly evident in his preoccupation with things military: his constant wars and the widespread images of him as a conqueror.

C. Nevertheless, it mattered to Peter that Russia be (and be perceived as) "civilized."
1. Peter hated the cultural look of old Russia and did all he could to remove it, insisting on Western dress, appearance, and customs.
2. These changes were, in part, superficial, but they had a deeper meaning: Peter believed that external things affected what was inside a person and usefully conveyed particular ideas about the sort of society the state was creating.

D. Peter's greatest creation—St. Petersburg, the new capital he built on the northern swampland he won in a battle with the Swedes—provides a clear picture of his vision.
1. Petersburg was a symbol of modern, secular power, order, and rationality (imposed from above).
2. The rationality of Petersburg is evident in its physical layout: a city of lines, squares, grids, and triangles.
3. Other aspects of Petersburg's design and architecture (such as squares and churches) also conveyed this ideal of control and order.
4. These were surface changes, but they were meant to convey to the world that that Russians were not savages and to teach Russians to think and act in a more civilized manner.

E. As a result of his many reforms, Peter transformed the shape of Russian life.
1. Mikhail Pogodin, a noted Russian intellectual writing in the mid-nineteenth century, was one of many who were astonished by the impact Peter had on Russia.
2. Others prepared the way for these changes to occur, but it was Peter who took the first step.
3. Peter's revolution was made possible by the Russian political system (including the absolutism of the Russian monarchical tradition—but none had ever used this power so boldly).

Essential Reading:

Lindsey Hughes, *Peter the Great: A Biography* (New Haven, 2002).

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought* (New York, 1985).

 ©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Paul Bushkovitch, *Peter the Great* (Oxford, 2001).

Lindsey Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great* (New Haven, 1998).

Vasili Kliuchevsky, *Peter the Great* (New York, 1958).

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton, 1995), vol. 1, chapter 2.

Questions to Consider:

1. Peter the Great sought to Europeanize Russia, but what aspects of European civilization did he admire and desire to import?
2. Did the reign of Peter the Great effect a "revolution from above" in Russian life, or were these only "reforms," continuing earlier trends and preserving the fundamental Russianness of politics and social life?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Four

The Age of Empresses—Catherine the Great

Scope: This lecture explores women's rule in eighteenth-century Russia, with a particular focus on the reigns of Elizabeth (Peter the Great's daughter) and Catherine the Great. It examines the efforts of these rulers to continue the Westernizing reform of Russia: to rationalize government, develop the economy and culture, extend the empire, and under Catherine, encourage some measure of civic involvement. In order to understand the ideas inspiring these reforms, the lecture looks at the ethos of power in the reigns of Elizabeth and Catherine. For Elizabeth, we consider her "cult of happiness." For Catherine, we look at the inspiration of Enlightenment ideas but also her insistence on the necessity of absolutism. The lecture concludes by examining the contradictory ways that Catherine culturally represented her own power.

Outline

I. After the death of Peter the Great in 1725, Russia was ruled by women for most of the rest of the century.

- **A.** From 1725–1727, Peter the Great's second wife, Catherine I, ruled Russia.
- **B.** After Catherine I's death, Peter the Great's twelve-year-old grandson, Peter II, took the throne until his death three years later.
- **C.** From 1730–1740, the empress was Anna, the daughter of Ivan V.
- **D.** Just before Anna died, she chose as her successor a two-month-old baby, her great-nephew, Ivan VI, and she appointed her German lover, Ernst-Johann Biron, as regent.
- **E.** Within a few months, Ivan VI was replaced on the throne by Elizabeth, the daughter of Peter the Great and Catherine I, who ruled for twenty years, from 1741–1761.
- **F.** When Elizabeth died, she was replaced by her nephew Peter III, who ruled for only six months before he was overthrown by guard troops and replaced by his wife, Catherine II.
- **G.** Catherine II (Catherine the Great) ruled for thirty-four years, from 1762–1796.
- **H.** Women held imperial power in eighteenth-century Russia for a number of reasons.
  1. Peter the Great decreed that the monarch could designate his own successor (male or female, noble or non-noble, blood relation or not).
  2. There was a shortage of healthy, able, adult male successors.
  3. Noblemen at court and the guards regiments enjoyed their growing power and believed that women would be more pliable and give them a greater voice at court.
- **I.** These women were not passive rulers, however. They had their own visions of power and did much to shape the Petrine tradition.

II. Elizabeth I reigned from 1741 to 1761.

- **A.** Elizabeth I differed dramatically from her father, Peter the Great, in personality.
  1. Beautiful and charming, Elizabeth was greatly admired. After the brutality and domination of Biron and the so-called German party, Elizabeth seemed to promise greater respect for Russians and the Russian elite.
  2. Unlike her energetic and forceful father, though, Elizabeth was notoriously indolent and pleasure-loving.
- **B.** Despite these differences, Elizabeth did much to continue Peter's legacy.
  1. She resumed efforts to routinize and rationalize government institutions.
  2. She encouraged cultural development (notably founding Moscow University).
  3. She did much to stimulate the economy (such as abolishing customs barriers and encouraging entrepreneurship).
  4. In foreign policy, Elizabeth continued to demonstrate that Russia was a European great power (especially by defeating Prussia as part of the Seven Years War and briefly occupying Berlin in 1760).
- **C.** But there were new elements appearing in this Petrine formula, which may be described as a feminine ideal of progress

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. Elizabeth I endeavored to bring a spirit of culturedness and beauty to Russia and to demonstrate to the world that Russia was not a savage land.
2. As a result, she built (or, in a few cases, totally rebuilt) some of Russia's most elegant royal palaces, which were invariably designed by Italian architects.
3. Elizabeth promoted what might be called a "cult of happiness" in Russian public life. In this spirit, At the time of her coronation in 1742, Mikhail Lomonosov composed an ode in her honor.
4. One can see her more secular version of the traditionally religious ideal of the *tishaishii tsar* (the "most tender" loving tsar).
5. The succession of lovers in Elizabeth's private life echoed this ideal of tenderness and her belief in the "cult of happiness."

III. These trends were further developed in the reign of Catherine II (called "Great" for her conquests in war and expansion of the empire).

A. Catherine came to the throne after guards officers overthrew her husband, Peter III.
1. Peter III's extreme pro-German orientation was considered intolerable.
2. The problem was not Peter's foreign blood, but his foreign orientation and his obvious hatred of Russia, its Church, and its language.
3. Catherine II was technically even less Russian than Peter, being entirely German in ancestry, but understood that her authority depended on her presenting herself as serving and strengthening Russia.

B. Catherine undertook numerous major reforms during her lengthy reign.
1. The first major reform was a codification of the laws, for which she convened, in 1767, a national "legislative commission."
2. She restructured the central administration to make procedures and departments more efficient.
3. She accepted Peter III's decision to end required state service for all nobles and to encourage them to become more active in local administration.
4. She enacted major reforms in local administration.
5. She promoted education and culture.
6. She worked to develop the economy.
7. She continued the expansion of the empire and the enhancement of Russia's status as a great power.

C. To understand these reforms, we need to look at how Catherine thought about the purposes of power.
1. In part, Catherine was inspired by Enlightenment ideas about the need for human freedom, equal rights, and democracy in the world.
2. At the same time, Catherine did not believe that Russia was ready for liberty or democracy and insisted on the value of autocracy as a source of order and progress.

D. How can these two attitudes be reconciled?
1. Some historians, as well as some disappointed French *philosophes*, considered this to be hypocrisy.
2. Others have attributed these two views to a change of mind in response to aristocratic efforts to claim more power, greater knowledge of Russia's problems, the threat of peasant rebellion, and the French Revolution.

E. But it is useful to keep in mind the dual tradition of the Russian autocracy that saw the ruler as both *groznyi* and *tishaishii*.
1. In fact, this duality is clearly visible in how Catherine (and her advocates) represented her rule.
2. Catherine deliberately cultivated a masculine and belligerent image of herself as ruler (*groznyi*).
3. Catherine also cultivated the image of the eighteenth-century ideal of the female monarch: the *tishaishii* tsar modernized into the ideal of a virtuous ruler bringing happiness.
4. The tension in this duality would continue to plague later monarchs.

Essential Reading:

John Alexander, *Catherine the Great: Life and Legend* (New York, 1989).

Isabel de Madariaga, *Catherine the Great: A Short History* (New Haven, 1990).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, 1981).

Marc Raeff, *Catherine the Great: A Profile* (New York, 1972).

George Vernadsky, Ralph Fisher, et al., eds., *A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917* (New Haven, 1972), vol. 2, chapters 11–12.

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton, 1995), vol. 1, chapters 3–4.

Questions to Consider:

1. How did the empresses of the eighteenth century continue and change the legacy of Peter I? Was there a "feminine" aspect to their rule?
2. What ideas inspired Catherine the Great? What sort of political and social order did she desire to create in Russia?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Five

Social Rebellion—The Pugachev Uprising

Scope: This lecture begins by considering the life of serfs in eighteenth-century Russia: the emergence and structures of serfdom, landlord paternalism, and serf communities. In the face of a fundamental lack of freedom, peasants found various ways to resist. After considering everyday forms of resistance to serfdom, as well as more violent forms of rebellion, the lecture focuses on the enormous uprising, during Catherine the Great's reign, led by Emelian Pugachev. The lecture describes the growth of the movement and its main course. To understand the motives of the rebels, the lecture examines the discontents of the various groups of followers and looks closely at the ideas and language of its leaders.

Outline

I. In eighteenth-century Russia, most people were peasants, most peasants were serfs, and the institution of serfdom was more intense than ever.

- **A.** Serfdom evolved gradually during the Muscovite period.
  - **1.** It ensured a sufficient supply of peasant labor to work the land that the state granted to nobles in return for service.
  - **2.** Peasant mobility was restricted by law.
  - **3.** Serfs and other bound peasants were technically not slaves: They were bound, not to landlords, but to the land—though, in practice, there was little difference.
- **B.** By the eighteenth century, gentry landlords often treated peasants as slaves.
  - **1.** Estate owners considered peasants lazy and childlike, with a weak moral sense, and thus, in need of help and guidance from nobles.
  - **2.** This attitude resulted in a strongly paternalist relation to serfs, which could mean both brutal control and enlightened provision of schools and hospitals.
  - **3.** Still, all serfs were bound to the land and, thus, were not free.

II. Peasants found many ways to cope with these conditions.

- **A.** They created a strong sense of community with the peasant commune (*obshchina* or *mir*).
  - **1.** Formally, the commune was the institution of the heads of households.
  - **2.** Landlords and the state found the commune convenient and allowed it a wide range of responsibilities.
  - **3.** The commune served the interests of both landlords and the state and protected the interests of peasants.
- **B.** Peasants were also deeply religious and found comfort and meaning from their faith.

III. Most of the time, peasants coped with their hardships, but they also found reasons and ways to fight back.

- **A.** They engaged in small, quiet, daily acts of resistance.
  - **1.** When working estate lands, they would work in a lazy and sloppy manner.
  - **2.** They would engage in petty theft.
  - **3.** They were also culturally resistant, stubbornly holding on to religious beliefs and practices that their "betters" told them were backward and ignorant.
- **B.** Peasants also engaged in more substantial and open forms of protest.
  - **1.** There were collective protests, which often involved a group drafting a petition of complaint.
  - **2.** The most common form of open protest was flight, especially to the frontiers of the south and southeast, where many joined Cossack communities.
  - **3.** Arson was an anonymous and relatively safe form of protest.
  - **4.** Murder was another form of open protest.
  - **5.** Rarely, the peasants engaged in mass uprisings.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

IV. In the eighteenth century, the most impressive of the peasant uprisings was led by Emelian Ivanovich Pugachev.

A. In November 1772, Pugachev arrived among Cossacks and peasants settled around the Ural River and identified himself as tsar Peter III come to deliver them from oppression.

1. Pugachev was a disgruntled former Don Cossack, a military deserter, and at least a sympathizer with Old Belief.

2. The primary group to join his growing army were Cossacks, but many others joined up as well, including serfs, Old Believers, and non-Russian minorities.

3. By October 1773, numerous forts and settlements had fallen to his motley army, and he began a six-month siege of Orenburg.

4. His growing army then marched on toward the Volga River region—with the goal of marching to St. Petersburg.

5. Thousands of peasants joined in the Volga region.

6. As the movement grew, it became increasingly violent.

7. The government and the elites of St. Petersburg and Moscow were terrified.

8. Once well-trained army troops arrived, the rebel army was defeated, and Pugachev was arrested and executed.

B. To better understand this revolt, it is useful to recognize the reasons it took hold where it did.

1. The Volga valley and the Ural region had been frontiers—places of escape—but noble landowners were increasingly beginning to establish estates there.

2. This region was also a center of religious dissidence, with numerous monasteries and hermitages of Old Believers.

3. Another group that responded to Pugachev's appeals, factory serfs, were also more numerous here than elsewhere.

4. This region was home to ethnic minorities who had grievances against the central state, especially the Bashkirs.

5. Most important, the Cossacks of the Urals were under assault from the expanding central state.

C. To understand this movement, we also need to examine its ideas and goals.

1. Printed proclamations by the movement's leaders were quite specific about their goals: making all peasants into crown peasants, granting the use of all land without requiring rent or dues, ensuring exemption from taxes and recruitment, returning to old religious traditions.

2. The tone and language of these proclamations and speeches helped to make these appeals compelling.

3. This discourse has many interesting features: the concept of a *tsar batiushka* who loves and cares for his people; the idea that nobles should serve the state; the view of their leader as a wanderer, even as a type of Christ-like figure whose return promises deliverance.

4. This religious dimension is highly important.

5. In general, the discourse of this movement offered a heady mixture of millenarian images of judgment, punishment, and deliverance.

6. Throughout these appeals, one idea was frequently and clearly articulated: freedom.

D. After reading these proclamations, Catherine II dismissed them with contempt.

1. As she saw it, Pugachev promised peasants "castles in the air."

2. But history often shows that such dreams of revenge, deliverance, and freedom have the power to mobilize.

Essential Reading:

John Alexander, *Emperor of the Cossacks: Pugachov and the Frontier Jacquerie of 1773–1775* (Lawrence, 1973).

Paul Avrich, *Russian Rebels, 1600–1800* (New York, 1972), chapter 4.

Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, 1981), chapter 16.

Supplementary Reading:

Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge, MA, 1987).

Questions to Consider:

 ©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. How can one reconcile the intensification of serfdom with the advancing Westernization and enlightenment of Russia?
2. What ideals and goals inspired Pugachev and his followers?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Six

Moral Rebellion—Nikolai Novikov

Scope: This lecture considers the first emergence of a critique of autocratic despotism in Russia by educated Russians. The lecture begins with an important context: the development of secular higher education for Russian elites and the emergence of an educated public and even of an intelligentsia. As an illustration of this development of an educated, critical, noble voice in Russia, the lecture focuses on the publisher and writer Nikolai Novikov, one of the most influential critics of autocracy in the late 1700s. After describing his biography, the lecture considers his ideas about his own class, the state, social reform, morality, and spirituality. The lecture looks at Russian Freemasonry as a source of ideas, subversive of the Russian status quo, about the human being and society. The lecture concludes with Novikov's imprisonment by Catherine the Great and the suppression of his work. Still, his legacy was more important than his individual fate.

Outline

I. Eighteenth-century Russia saw the emergence of an educated elite, a force that both aided the state and criticized it, offered it new ideas and sometimes opposed it.

A. This development begins with the Russian nobility, who absorbed certain aspects of Western culture.

B. The emergence of an educated elite was closely linked to the spread of secular higher education in Russia.

1. Simultaneously, there was a shift in emphasis from technical and professional training to an education that was more broadly liberal and humanist.

2. Ivan Betskoi, Catherine the Great's education adviser, argued that the purpose of education was to provide educated, intelligent members of society by developing the whole person.

C. What were some of the major consequences of this growth of an educated class in Russia?

1. A growing number of young Russians were inspired by the concept of the natural dignity and worth of the individual and were eager to be useful.

2. Closely related is the emergence of an *intelligentsia*, educated individuals who criticized the realities they encountered on the basis of high moral and philosophical ideas.

3. Another development nurtured by education was the emergence of a public sphere, an important domain in which individuals can come together to discuss matters of public concern and where free "public opinion" can be formed.

II. The life of Nikolai Novikov (1744–1818) clearly illustrates this development.

A. Novikov began as a typical member of the elite: gentry background, education at Moscow University, service in the elite Izmailovskii Guard, appointment to the Legislative Committee.

B. In 1769, Novikov retired from state service to devote himself to literary pursuits—as a publisher, printer, editor, and writer.

C. He established a series of influential (and controversial) satirical journals.

1. Novikov criticized all sorts of vices in public and private life.

2. Landowners who boasted of their nobility but were cruel to their peasants and of no use to society were the main target of his criticism.

3. He also combined praise of Catherine the Great with lighthearted criticism.

4. Despite his jabs at her, Catherine continued to support his publishing work financially, especially his publication of historical documents and his efforts to translate Western classics.

D. Although Novikov's criticisms were some of the harshest condemnations of social abuses written during this period, his goal was to appeal to the consciences of his fellow Russian nobles, not to attack the system itself.

E. Novikov's social and political criticism was fundamentally ethical.

1. For the state, his ideal was a patriarchal ruler who was above any particular interests and who would unite the entire nation and serve the common good.

2. The ideal nobles, in Novikov's view, would act paternalistically toward their peasants, neither abusing nor exploiting them, and would care for and instruct them.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. Novikov sought a moral rather than a social or political revolution.

F. Like many of the educated and sensitive nobles of this time, Novikov was searching for answers and was unsure how far to press his criticisms.
1. When the Pugachev rebellion erupted, he saw the depth and ferocity of people's anger, as well as the brutality of which both the peasants and the state were capable.
2. This convinced him of the futility of revolution.
3. At this point, in 1775, Novikov joined the growing Masonic movement in Russia.

G. In Russia, as in Western Europe and North America, Freemasonry was quite popular among young, educated nobles in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.
1. The Freemason was expected to develop his inner spiritual resources; this was his duty to himself.
2. At the same time, the Freemason had a duty to concern himself with the welfare and dignity of his fellow human beings.

III. Novikov was inspired by the ideals of Freemasonry to redouble his efforts as publisher and journalist.

A. In 1777, he began publishing the journal *Morning Light*, a serious philosophical and moral journal that tried to promote virtue.

B. Its clear and profound message was that human beings are not miserable fallen creatures, but made in God's image and, hence, equal in rights and dignity.

C. Although not original, for these were the ideas that pervaded Enlightenment thinking and helped shaped the American Revolution, Novikov's achievement was in spreading and popularizing this Enlightenment humanism among Russia's growing educated class.

D. Novikov's work as an advocate of Enlightenment ideas was prodigious.
1. In 1779, he moved to Moscow to take over the lease of the Moscow University Press.
2. After Catherine II allowed private individuals to set up publishing houses in 1783, Novikov established his own printing and publishing firm.
3. He continued to edit and contribute to a number of journals.
4. He also actively promoted the book trade in Russia.
5. As a publisher, Novikov established the first series of children's books.
6. In addition, during the 1787 famine, he helped to organize charitable famine relief.

E. As the most visible figure in the development of independent cultural life and opinion in Russia, Novikov stood at the forefront of the emergence in Russia of a public sphere and an intelligentsia.

F. Catherine the Great grew increasingly nervous about such independence, and she was suspicious of the Freemasons.
1. She wrote stories and brochures ridiculing the Masons (and Novikov) as obscurantist mystics.
2. After the French Revolution, she took more decisive action against Novikov and others: In 1792, Novikov was arrested and condemned to fifteen years' imprisonment.

G. Novikov emerged from prison four years later, amnestied at the beginning of Paul's reign. Broken physically and financially, he sought comfort mainly in mysticism.

H. Despite this sad ending for Novikov personally, he was part of a larger process that could not be stopped.
1. The emergence of a growing public sphere in Russia.
2. The development of an intelligentsia: critically minded, morally driven, serving their nation without being subservient to the state.

Essential Reading:

Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, 1981), chapters 33–34.

Supplementary Reading:

Nikolai Novikov, "On Man's High Estate," in *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology* (New York, 1966), pp. 62–67.

W. Gareth Jones, *Nikolay Novikov: Enlightener of Russia* (Cambridge, 1984).

Marc Raeff, *The Origins of the Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York, 1966).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. In what ways was state-sponsored higher education transforming Russian life?
2. Why did Catherine the Great seek to silence voices such as Novikov's? What made his arguments dangerous?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Seven
Alexander I—Imagining Reform

Scope: This lecture begins with the reign of Paul I—important less for what Paul accomplished than for the symbolism of his authoritarianism and his efforts to undo reform and, especially, for the strong aristocratic rejection of these tsarist traditions. Overthrown and murdered, he was replaced by his son Alexander I. The lecture considers the high expectations surrounding Alexander's accession, his important reforms, and his considerations of constitutional reform in Russia. At the same time, however, Alexander never delivered on this talk and even resisted certain efforts at reform. The lecture explores the contradictions in Alexander's reign by examining his ideas about power: his sincere embrace of Enlightenment values, his love of military culture, his limited conception of constitutionalism, his belief in the necessity of power and order to ensure happiness. The lecture concludes by considering Alexander's growing mysticism and doubt.

Outline

I. Anxieties about the dangers of too much reform became especially visible in the final reign of the eighteenth century: the brief rule of Catherine the Great's son Paul I (ruled 1796–1801).

- **A.** Paul had little lasting impact on Russian politics, but the symbolism of his reign is significant for what it tells us about changes in Russia.
- **B.** Paul I sought to undo much of his mother's work.
  - **1.** He signaled this by removing and reburying, with special honor, his murdered father, Peter III.
  - **2.** Deeply suspicious of independent social activity, Paul revoked the Charter of the Nobility and the Charter of Towns.
  - **3.** Greater militarization was his main ideal for Russian life.
  - **4.** To help ensure a martial spirit in Russian life, he made sure that women would never rule again by proclaiming a new law of succession that restored primogeniture in the male line.
- **C.** Paul endeavored to revive the tradition of the all-powerful, dominating autocrat, ruling according to personal will and whim (the *groznyi tsar*). This was especially visible in his personal style.
  - **1.** Paul had a short temper and a brutal manner.
  - **2.** Hating and fearing French influence, which he considered revolutionary, Paul banned French-style fashions.
  - **3.** He also banned foreign books, foreign travel, and even the use of certain foreign words.
  - **4.** Yet, at the same time, Paul was a religious man and saw himself as a Christian ruler and as a "father" to his people.
- **D.** Elite society, much changed, quickly made it clear that they would not accept these sorts of restrictions any longer.
- **E.** When Paul was murdered by palace guards in a coup in March 1801, the response among the Russian elite was often joyful.

II. Within elite society, the accession of Alexander I (ruled 1801–1825) was met with widespread jubilation and high hopes.

- **A.** Alexander himself encouraged this admiration by explicitly promising to rule in the spirit of his grandmother, Catherine II, revering many of his father's anti-reforms and embarking on his own course of reform.
- **B.** Alexander I is a complex ruler, difficult to interpret.
  - **1.** He has been variously called a "sphinx," an "enigma," even a "crowned Hamlet."
  - **2.** Yet Alexander's seeming contradictoriness and strangeness has much to do with the contradictory Russian political tradition that saw the tsar as both *groznyi* and *tishaishii*.
- **C.** Alexander I began his reign with a series of important reform efforts.
  - **1.** He established an "Unofficial Committee" to discuss major political and social reforms, including a constitution and the abolition of serfdom.
  - **2.** The central state apparatus, especially the Senate, was made stronger.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. Inefficient colleges were replaced by more efficient and responsible ministries.
4. Legislation was enacted to mitigate some of the harshest conditions relating to serfs.
5. The economy was encouraged by allowing non-nobles to own estates.
6. New universities and schools were established.

D. But despite the constant talk about constitutional reform, nothing was accomplished.
1. This failure to act had many possible explanations, including distraction with international affairs, political unrest in Europe, the influence of the conservative Austrian foreign minister Metternich, an unwillingness to alienate the nobility, and Alexander's growing personal mysticism.
2. Alexander also vigorously opposed giving real legislative power to the Senate and expressed suspicion of anyone who might oppose his autocratic will.

III. Alexander's ideas about power offer a means of reconciling these two aspects of his policies.

A. There are good reasons to see his enlightened talk as serious and sincere.
1. What we know about Alexander suggests that he took the teachings of the Enlightenment deeply to heart.
2. These ideals pervaded his education (which was personally overseen by his grandmother, Catherine the Great).
3. Alexander's tutor, the Swiss philosopher Frederic-Cesar de la Harpe, further instructed him in the central values of the Enlightenment—especially that a ruler should be guided by reason and care for his people and that society should respect the natural equality of human beings.
4. In his first public statements as ruler, Alexander tried to express his self-ideal as a virtuous and caring ruler, and official praise echoed these images.
5. All of this reflects—with modernized features—the old ideal of the *tishaishii tsar*, though in Enlightenment colors.

B. There was another side to Alexander's political personality: Like his father, he loved all things military.

C. To reconcile these conflicting images of Alexander as "blessed angel" and "passionate soldier," we need to explore his understanding of the key notion of a "constitution."
1. For Alexander and associates, a constitution did not encompass the idea of a separation and balance of powers or a check on executive power.
2. Instead, Alexander's notion of a constitution involved the idea of an orderly system of administration and law, a *Rechtsstaat* free from arbitrariness.
3. For him, this law-based but powerful autocracy was the key to the nation's political happiness, a guarantor of order, and a dynamic force for change.

IV. In the final years of Alexander's reign, there were signs that he was losing confidence in this rationalistic faith that order will lead to happiness.

A. Alexander began to express his growing doubts that humans can ever make the world a better place.

B. These doubts were reinforced by his travels around Russia, where he witnessed firsthand the sufferings and backwardness of the mass of ordinary Russians.

C. These doubts were further strengthened by his growing religious mysticism.

D. A key moment in Alexander's existential crisis was the horrible flood of 1824 in St. Petersburg—which appeared to many as a symbol of the failure of rationalism, a symbol of the limited power of humans to control and improve the world.

Essential Reading:

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (Oxford, 2000), chapter 25.

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton, 1995), vol. 1, chapters 6–8.

Supplementary Reading:

Allen McConnell, *Tsar Alexander I: Paternalistic Reformer* (New York, 1970).

George Vernadsky, Ralph Fisher, et al., eds., *A Source Book for Russian History* (New Haven, 1972), chapter 13.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. Describe Alexander I's vision of civic and national happiness. Was this unrealistic?
2. How can one reconcile Alexander's love of all things military with his contemporary idealization as a "blessed angel"?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Eight
The Decembrist Revolution

Scope: This lecture looks at the origins, history, and consequences of a remarkable event in Russian history: the unsuccessful armed uprising against autocracy by groups of educated nobles belonging to secret societies in December 1825. The lecture begins with the succession crisis after the death of Alexander I and describes the armed uprising that accompanied it and the suppression of the rebellion. It then examines the political programs of the rebels. In order to understand the underlying ideas and values more closely, the lecture looks in detail at a single individual, Nikolai Turgenev. The lecture considers his biography, his experiences in Western Europe, his association with other Russians troubled by their autocratic government and by serfdom, and his ideas for change. Particular attention is paid to the influence of Enlightenment ideas of humanism and rationalism, as well as Romantic ideas about the individual.

Outline

I. The Decembrist rebellion occurred in the midst of a succession crisis after the childless tsar Alexander I died unexpectedly in November 1825.

- **A.** There was considerable public confusion over who would take the throne.
  - **1.** In accordance with Paul's law of succession, the public expected it to be Alexander's eldest brother, Constantine.
  - **2.** But it was publicly announced that the new tsar would be Alexander's youngest brother, Nicholas (because of Constantine's morganatic marriage, though this reason was not announced).
  - **3.** Nicholas was widely viewed as a reactionary, whereas Constantine was thought to have more liberal, Westernizing views.
  - **4.** Taking advantage of the confusion, a group of liberal-minded aristocrats, members of the secret Northern Society in St. Petersburg, made plans to seize power.
- **B.** This "revolution" was to take place on Senate Square on December 14, 1825, the date set for swearing allegiance to the new emperor Nicholas.
  - **1.** But several of the leaders grew fearful and did not show up at the square.
  - **2.** This lack of leadership meant that on the square were a few officers who were either unwilling or unable to take command and a few thousand soldiers who knew little or nothing of their officers' original plans.
  - **3.** The new tsar, Nicholas I, ordered troops to suppress the rebellion with force.
  - **4.** This rebellion had echoes in other parts of the country, especially in the Ukraine, where rebel troops led by the secret Southern Society were marching toward the capital.
  - **5.** The leaders were severely punished; 125 men were sentenced to hard labor or exile and 5 men were publicly executed.

II. What did these rebels, all privileged young nobles and officers, want?

- **A.** As can be seen from their written programs, the Decembrists saw a strong state as essential for progress.
  - **1.** The "constitution," written primarily by Nikita Murav'ev for the Northern Society, envisioned a Russia ruled by a hereditary monarch who would share power with an elected legislature.
  - **2.** Pavel Pestel's "Russian Law" (*Russkaia pravda*) envisioned ten years of dictatorship followed by a centralized and authoritarian, although democratically elected, government.
- **B.** The point of this strong authority, however, was progressive change.
  - **1.** The Decembrists wanted to promote and ensure citizenship and the rights of individuals.
  - **2** They insisted on basic civil rights: freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly.
  - **3.** They also vehemently opposed serfdom.

III. To appreciate the human meaning of the Decembrist movement, we look at one Decembrist, Nikolai Turgenev (1789–1871).

- **A.** Turgenev was one of the organizers of the Northern Society and of secret societies that preceded it, for which, in 1826, he was sentenced to decapitation, though he had left Russia the year before the uprising.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. Socially, Turgenev was exceptionally privileged.

C. Nonetheless, Turgenev was profoundly discontented, frustrated, and angry.
  1. One cause of this discontent was disappointment with Alexander I.
  2. No less, like many young, educated Russians, he had begun to see the world differently and to expect more from it.

D. To understand this perceptual transformation, one must remember that most of the future Decembrists had been to Western Europe.
  1. Many had been officers in the Russian army as it marched westward through Europe after Napoleon's defeat.
  2. Turgenev experienced Europe as a student at the university in Göttingen (1808–1812).
  3. But whether in Europe as soldiers or students, young Russians like Turgenev had similar experiences discovering ideas.
  4. They also saw a freer and more prosperous life that was previously unknown to them.
  5. Young, elite Russians like Turgenev were embarrassed by their country's backwardness.

E. In addition, the early years of the nineteenth century were a time of enormous intellectual and cultural ferment in Russia.
  1. Education was expanded and more publications were available.
  2. There were increasing opportunities to meet and discuss ideas.

IV. In their modes of thinking, men like Turgenev were influenced by both the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and the Romanticism of the nineteenth century.

A. They were humanists.
  1. They despised the conservative view of man as an essentially evil, fallen creature, believing that every human being is endowed with reason and deserves a life of dignity and respect.
  2. Thus, they hated serfdom.

B. They were rationalists.
  1. They believed that the world is malleable and must be transformed in accordance with the dictates of reason.
  2. They saw the best hope for change in a strong state led by rational and wise leaders.

C. They were also influenced by Romanticism.
  1. They were nationalists who considered it their sacred mission to save Russia from its backwardness.
  2. They had a typical Romantic view of the individual: They dreamed of a society in which everyone, including themselves, could realize their full potential as human beings.
  3. They wanted to live their own lives for some higher purpose.

D. The story of Decembrism in Russia involved the disappointment experienced by men like Turgenev in the face of the glaring contrast between what they felt ought to be and what was.
  1. They believed in rationality and the rule of law, but they saw personal and arbitrary government.
  2. They believed in the natural dignity of all human beings and the importance of personal self-fulfillment, but they saw the slavery of the majority and the restriction of the rights and freedoms of the elite.
  3. They wanted Russia to be respected in the world, but they saw that their country was feared and often viewed with contempt.

Essential Reading:

Anatole Mazour, *The First Russian Revolution, 1825* (Stanford, 1964).

Supplementary Reading:

Marc Raeff, *The Decembrist Movement* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966).

Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford, 1979), chapter 3.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. Why was the notion of a strong state—even a temporary dictatorship—central to the programs of the Decembrists? Did this contradict their ideas about individual rights and dignity?
2. Compare the ideas and values of the Decembrists to Novikov's criticisms of autocracy.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Nine

Nicholas I—Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality

Scope: This lecture looks at the rule of Nicholas I and the ideas about power and order that inspired the Russian state at that time. It looks first at Nicholas I's image as one of the most reactionary rulers in modern Russian history, and the policies that shaped this view, but also at his image as majestic Jupiter. The lecture then considers more closely his political personality and beliefs—both his conservative values and his religious and moral ideals. Finally, the lecture explores the very important efforts during his reign to articulate an official ideology for the Russian state, with its guiding principles of Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality. We examine each of these as key ideas for understanding Russian state politics in the nineteenth century (and beyond).

Outline

I. In modern Russian politics, a certain pattern had begun to emerge: Westernizing reform often alternated with hesitation, conservatism, even reaction.

- **A.** Sometimes, we have seen, this is apparent in the alternation of regimes.
- **B.** But this hesitancy toward reform is no less often visible in the work of individual rulers, as we saw in the reigns of Catherine and Alexander, in particular.
- **C.** This pattern again becomes visible when Alexander's younger brother, Nicholas, came to the throne.

II. Contemporaries generally agreed that Nicholas I (ruled 1825–1855) was exceptionally ruthless as a man and as a ruler.

- **A.** They spoke of his personal harshness, his outbursts of rage, his obsession with regimentation and militarism—his *groznyi* qualities.
- **B.** His desire for order had a positive (even progressive) side.
  - **1.** He completed a codification of the laws.
  - **2.** He regulated some aspects of the lives of state peasants—leading to some improvements in conditions, though also higher taxes.
- **C.** But his concern with order also had a harsher face.
  - **1.** Nicholas was determined to defend traditional monarchies (and traditional social orders) in Europe against the rising tide of democratic revolution.
  - **2.** He also implemented intense Russification policies throughout the empire (especially in Poland).
  - **3.** Under his rule, there was growing cultural repression: Only officially approved views were allowed in the classroom, censorship became more restrictive than ever before, even science was put under tighter controls.
- **D.** Many felt that Nicholas had created what amounted to a police state in Russia.
  - **1.** Nicholas established a special political police agency that was secretive and responsive to the personal will of the emperor (Third Department of His Majesty's Own Chancery).
  - **2.** The purpose of the Third Department was broad, but two goals were clear: obtaining information and suppressing disorder.
- **E.** In the aftermath of the European revolutions of 1830 and 1848, Nicholas's police state became increasingly rigid, especially as these upheavals convinced him that Russia had been spared precisely because he was so ruthless.
- **F.** Contemporaries who met Nicholas invariably commented not only on his brutality as a ruler but also on his imposing physical presence (he was 6 feet, 3 inches, tall).

III. The complexity of Nicholas's political personality reveals complicated motives.

- **A.** First, there is evidence that Nicholas's legendary ruthlessness and obsession with order reflected not confidence but fear that almost verged on panic.
  - **1.** He was obsessed with revolution, for example.
  - **2.** His obsession with regimentation, orderliness, neatness, and precision extended well beyond reason.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. Nicholas had a deep religious faith; however, his religiosity was not the restless seeking for truth that occupied many educated Russians but a simple, unquestioning faith.

C. Nicholas was known for his moral harshness, his inability to forgive.

D. At the same time, Nicholas cultivated a public image as a family man.
  1. Images of the tsar with his family were made widely available for the first time.
  2. But this was not just a public image. Nicholas cultivated his own idyllic family life.

E. All these aspects—religion, morality, family life—contribute to an image of the ruler as virtuous—as a *tishaishii tsar* (loving and pious), as well as a *groznyi tsar* (awesome and mighty).

IV. These years of Nicholas's rule also saw the clearest articulation yet (especially by the Minister of Education, Sergei Uvarov) of an explicit ideology of Russian politics, embodied in three key principles: Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality.

A. Orthodoxy (*pravoslavie*) was always listed first in this trinity of principles.
  1. This assertion of religion was a reaction against the dominant convictions of the Age of Reason, as can be seen, for example, in the arguments against reliance on reason by the journalist and historian Mikhail Pogodin.
  2. This philosophical position had practical and conservative implications for politics: Human society was not perfectible and earthly authority should be left in the hands of established rulers, whom God has sanctified and guides.
  3. At the same time, these arguments assumed that authority must be in the spirit of God's will.

B. The connection of all this to autocracy (*samoderzhavie*) is obvious.
  1. Autocratic rule was justified because power is willed by God.
  2. Autocratic rule was viewed as absolutely necessary (as good).
  3. In part, this was a negative argument: The strong hand of government was needed to keep order.
  4. But this was also a positive political argument: Autocratic power was seen as the best means to ensure progress and happiness and the Russian polity seen as a "family" in which the tsar was the stern but benevolent father (*tsar-batiushka*).

C. The third component of official ideology is the most puzzling and often debated of the three: nationality (*narodnost'*).
  1. In part, this was simply the reverse side of autocracy: a view of the Russian people as loving and obedient subjects ("children") of the tsar and the landlords.
  2. These ideas had their roots in European thought of the day. A widespread Romantic ideal was that every nation has its unique genius; Russia's genius, it was felt, was the unique bond of love and devotion between the people and the tsar.
  3. Many Russians had already begun to feel that this was an archaic and dangerous ideal and not suitable for a modern state in the modern European world.

Essential Reading:

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (Oxford, 2000), chapters 26–28.

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, (Princeton, 1995), vol. 1, chapters 9–13.

Supplementary Reading:

Bruce Lincoln, *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats, 1825–1861* (DeKalb, 1986).

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley, 1959).

Cynthia Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (DeKalb, 1984).

Questions to Consider:

1. In what ways can the "reactionary" Nicholas I be seen as still continuing the legacy of reform of Peter I and Catherine II and in what ways was he trying to reverse their reforms?

2. What is the importance of religion in Russian politics in the reign of Nicholas I and before?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Ten
Alexander Pushkin, Russia's National Poet

Scope: This lecture considers the life and the powerful myth of Alexander Pushkin, Russia's most beloved writer. It begins with Pushkin's life as both privileged insider and difficult outsider—as aristocrat and African, as privileged government official and rebel poet. To more fully understand Pushkin and what his life tells us about Russia's changing culture, the lecture looks at his personal style of living and writing, in particular, his spirit of serious play. Pushkin's tragic death in a duel is then described, along with the growing cult around Pushkin that followed. The lecture concludes by considering the meaning of Pushkin as a symbol of the Russian nation and of what it means to be Russian.

Outline

I. Widely considered Russia's national poet—even part of the definition of Russia itself—Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837) was both a privileged insider and a difficult outsider to Russian life.

A. Born in Moscow in 1799, Pushkin's aristocratic family could, on his father's side, trace its lineage back for centuries to the old Muscovite nobility.

B. By contrast, his maternal great-grandfather was Ibrahim Hannibal, said to be the son of an Abyssinian prince given by the Turkish sultan to Peter the Great.

C. This African heritage, as well as his aristocratic lineage, was a part of Pushkin's self-image.

1. Pushkin was taunted for his African heritage and features, which were sometimes a source of self-hatred.

2. But this African ancestry was also a source of pride for Pushkin in being an exotic outsider. In his novel-in-verse *Evgenii Onegin*, he writes of fleeing Russia "for my Africa."

D. The duality of being both insider and outsider was visible in Pushkin's biography.

1. Most obviously, he was a privileged insider. He was educated in St. Petersburg at the elite new *lycée* directly attached to the emperor's summer palace at Tsarskoe selo.

2. After graduating, he worked at a good but easy job in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and enjoyed the pleasures of life in the capital.

3. At the same time, Pushkin seemed to perceive himself as an outsider: He became associated with semi-legal literary and political societies and was close friends with many future Decembrists.

4. He even wrote some mildly political poems about liberty that circulated hand-to-hand and some pointed satirical epigrams.

5. Because of this daring, if modest, opposition, he was dismissed from the civil service and forced into what amounted to house arrest on his estate.

6. In response to the Decembrist rebellion, he wrote a sympathetic poem to the rebels in Siberian exile.

E. In 1826, the new tsar, Nicholas I, pardoned Pushkin, but to ensure that he behaved, Nicholas became Pushkin's personal censor.

1. Pushkin's writings often praised Russia and its rulers, but he also continued to write politically critical poems.

2. Some of his greatest works—such as the epic poem about Peter the Great, "The Bronze Horseman"—were filled with warnings about the dangers of unbridled power and arrogant political will.

F. One view of these contradictions (the old Soviet view) is that Pushkin was truly a rebel but had to pretend to be loyal to protect his freedom. I would suggest that he was *both* loyalist and rebel, just as he was both Russian and African, insider and outsider.

II. To more fully understand Pushkin's identity and his cultural place in his own time, we must examine his style of living and writing.

A. Play was one of the highest values for Pushkin; it pervaded everything he did and, indeed, was part of the increasingly Westernized culture of nineteenth-century Russia.

1. At the *lycée*, Pushkin had the reputation for being creative but rather flighty.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. As a government official in St. Petersburg, he reveled in the pleasures of high society, including gambling (which soon led him deeply into debt) and women.

B. Pushkin's literary writing reflected this culture of play, both in its subject matter (*Evgenii Onegin*, for example, begins with a loving description of the pleasures of city life) and in his versatile and protean style.

C. But this was *serious* play: Pushkin worked hard to make his writings appear brilliant and easy.

D. As early as 1825, some readers were complaining that he was not sufficiently high-minded and serious, and sales of his works declined in the early 1830s.

III. When Pushkin died—suddenly and tragically—his reputation was transformed.

A. By 1836, Pushkin's situation had become quite difficult: His literary popularity was waning, his gambling debts were mounting, and he had continuing problems with the tsar.

B. In addition, rumors were surfacing about a flirtation between his young wife and the young officer Georges d'Anthès.

1. Pushkin challenged d'Anthès to a duel, which was resolved when d'Anthès agreed to marry Pushkin's sister-in-law.
2. When the flirtation continued, Pushkin sent d'Anthès's father (the Dutch ambassador) an insulting letter, leading young d'Anthès to challenge Pushkin.
3. They fought on January 27, 1837—Pushkin lost and died two days later of his injuries.

C. Pushkin's death—reminding people of what they had lost—transformed his waning popularity into new enthusiasm.

1. When his body lay in state, thousands of people paid their respects, and some tried to take bits of his coat and pieces of his hair.
2. His books began to sell extremely well.
3. Such outpouring of emotion for a poet—or any nongovernmental figure—had never occurred before, and the government grew fearful that this might turn into a political demonstration.
4. Newspapers—despite government warnings not to emphasize Pushkin's importance—declared Pushkin to be Russia's "national glory" and his death, a national tragedy.

IV. The cult of Pushkin as national symbol grew steadily

A. This first signs of this mythic Pushkin had begun to emerge even before he died, when Nikolai Gogol spoke of Pushkin as a "national poet" possessing a Russianness that transcended class and time.

B. A high point of the growing cult of Pushkin as symbol of the nation came in 1880 at the three-day celebration organized around the unveiling of a monument to Pushkin in Moscow.

1. This was the first major monument in Russia not dedicated to a political or military leader and built with public initiative and public funds.
2. Fedor Dostoevskii spoke at the unveiling, declaring Pushkin to be both uniquely Russian and a "universal man."

C. Throughout the twentieth century, Pushkin has been described as symbolizing all that is great in Russia.

D. But what has Pushkin symbolized to so many?

1. Pure Russianness but also the entwining of Russian culture with other cultures.
2. Love of country and loyalty but also discontent and rebellion.
3. An intellect that was serious and earnest but also the culture of play and pleasure.
4. In other words, the contradictoriness that is so central to the meaning of Russian history.

Essential Reading:

Alexander Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin and Other Poems (Everyman's Library Pocket Poets)* (New York, 1999).
Victor Terras, *A History of Russian Literature* (New Haven, 1991), pp. 182–184, 204–216, 239–243.

 ©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

David Bethea, *Realizing Metaphors: Alexander Pushkin and the Life of the Poet* (Madison, 1998).

William Mills Todd, III, *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin: Ideology, Institutions and Narrative* (Cambridge, MA, 1986).

Abram Terts (Andrei Sinyavsky), *Strolls with Pushkin* (New Haven, 1993).

Questions to Consider:

1. Compare Pushkin's attitudes to those of Novikov and the Decembrists. Was there anything intellectually or ethically serious in his spirit of play?
2. What does the response to Pushkin's death tell us about changes in Russian public life since the end of the eighteenth century?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Eleven
The Birth of the Intelligentsia

Scope: Focusing on the 1830s, this lecture looks at the emergence of one of the most important social and cultural groups in Russian history: the intelligentsia. The lecture defines this term and looks at common characteristics: a shared Romantic philosophical outlook and preoccupation with ideas but also a common Romantic temperament. The lecture then turns to the arguments of a single individual, Petr Chaadaev, whose ideas about Russia's past and future shocked and inspired many educated Russians. We examine his brutal critique of Russia's backwardness and his emerging argument that Russia's future is necessarily connected to the West. The lecture concludes with the arguments made against Chaadaev by the Slavophiles, who believed Russia had a unique destiny in the world rooted in traditions of community and freedom that had been eroded by Russia's Westernization since Peter I.

Outline

I. One of the most important developments of the nineteenth century, especially for discussions of Russia's fate, was the emergence of the intelligentsia.

- **A.** The term *intelligentsia* meant not a social category (a class or occupational group) but a cultural category, such that *intelligenty* were defined by their particular way of looking at the world.
  - **1.** This culture was defined in opposition to a repressive and restrictive political and social order.
  - **2.** *Intelligenty* believed that they were fighting, not for themselves, but for others and for ideas.
  - **3.** Although ideas were central, the intelligentsia was also defined by its spirit, which had an element of religious fervor.
- **B.** The key period in which the Russian intelligentsia took shape as an organized movement was the 1830s and 1840s, which was also the time when the intelligentsia split into two main competing currents: "Westernizers" and "Slavophiles."

II. Although there were clear differences between these two groups, these should not be overstated.

- **A.** They almost all knew one another personally, were from the same small social class (educated noblemen), and were even friends.
- **B.** More important, they shared certain essential beliefs and values and a certain sensibility.
- **C.** Both groups shared a common philosophical outlook.
  - **1.** Westernizers and Slavophiles were both deeply influenced by German Romantic philosophers (especially Friedrich Schelling and Georg Wilhem Friedrich Hegel) and the belief that the world is "organic" and "whole."
  - **2.** Thus, truth was to be found, not by mechanical reasoning, but through instinct and the senses.
  - **3.** These ideas were extremely important for the life of the Russian intelligentsia in the 1830s and 1840s: Individuals had to discover where they personally fit into this grand unified scheme and to discover Russia's place in this totality.
- **D.** The Westernizers and Slavophiles also shared a Romantic temperament.
  - **1.** In part, this meant being emotional, enthusiastic, and dreamy.
  - **2.** This also meant being excited about poetry, nature, friendship, and romantic love.
  - **3.** Most of all, these young men were fervent about abstract ideas.

III. In 1836, into this impassioned intellectual and emotional milieu came Petr Chaadaev's "first philosophical letter."

- **A.** It would be difficult to exaggerate the agitation that this letter provoked.
- **B.** This response was partly to Chaadaev's tone and style, which was full of bitterness and anguish.
- **C.** Most important, though, was that Chaadaev addressed the question of Russia's historical nature and destiny as a nation.
  - **1.** He offered an audacious explication of the emptiness of Russia's national culture.
  - **2.** Unlike a normal civilization that develops and evolves over time, Russia was like time's orphan.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. For Chaadaev, Russia's unique position on the boundaries of Asia and Europe gave it a special possibility in the world.
4. But Russia's fate, he worried, was to fail to be either East or West and to fail to be original.

D. Chaadaev's arguments provoked varying reactions from different groups.
1. The government declared Chaadaev mad and placed him under house arrest.
2. Most intellectuals rejected his evident despair but drew different conclusions depending on their attitudes to Russia's Westernization.

E. Chaadaev's own response is also of interest.
1. In 1837, he wrote "Apology of a Madman"
2. Here, he began to reconsider Russia's backwardness as an advantage: Because Russia has no history, reason is given a freer hand.

IV. The Slavophiles were among Chaadaev's most virulent critics.

A. Although they shared Chaadaev's Romantic view of history as the source of nationhood, they saw in Russia's past the history that Chaadaev did not see.

B. To demonstrate this history, they studied and collected folklore and popular culture.

C. The Slavophiles agreed that some Russians were indeed "homeless nomads," but these were only the *Westernized* Russians, not the common people who preserved national traditions.

D. A communal spirit was the most important of these preserved popular traditions.
1. The Slavophiles called this spirit *sobornost'*.
2. This means a society existing as a community, united by free will on the basis of shared values.
3. This idea was at the heart of all Slavophile thinking about Russia and its future.

E. This idea is most fully explored in the works of Aleksei Khomiakov, who believed that Russia embodied the values of *sobornost'* like no other nation.
1. The particular character of Russian religion (Eastern Orthodoxy) was seen to nurture this communal spirit.
2. The Orthodox Church did not agree and forbade the publication of Khomiakov's works. The Holy Synod saw the idea of *sobornost'* as placing too much emphasis on faith and will and too little on the institutions of the Church.
3. Slavophiles also pointed to certain secular customs, especially the peasant commune, as sustaining the traditions of "communal social life."

F. The Slavophile ideal lay backward in history, not ahead; it was a traditional, conservative ideology.

G. But the Slavophiles were also radicals who were critical of the status quo.
1. They believed that the Petrine autocracy had steadily eaten away at the cultural features that made Russia great.
2. For the Slavophiles, the only salvation was to return to Russia's true roots: religious, collectivist, and free.
3. But this meant that the Slavophiles opposed much of the existing political and social order, including serfdom, the lack of civil rights, the death penalty, and government intrusion into private life.
4. Thus, in many ways, the Slavophiles were not conservatives at all but idealistic visionaries and even radicals who found a better future in a partly imagined past.

Essential Reading:

Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford, 1979), chapters 5–6.

Supplementary Reading:

James Edie, James Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, *Russian Philosophy* (Chicago, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 101–269.

Philip Pomper, *The Russian Revolutionary Intelligentsia* (Arlington Heights, IL, 1970), chapter 3.

Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* (Oxford, 1975).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. Do you agree with Chaadaev that Westernization meant the loss of Russia's connection to history? Why did he first see this as a disaster, then as an opportunity?
2. What are the implications of the Slavophiles' key idea *sobornost'* for their vision of Russia's future?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twelve
Westernizers—Vissarion Belinskii

Scope: This lecture considers the personalities and ideas of the Westernizers, the main critics of the Slavophiles. The focus is on the life and ideas of a single exemplary Westernizer intelligent: Vissarion Belinskii. The lecture considers his social origins and education; the passion with which he, and other Russian *intelligenty*, struggled to find the meaning of life; and his passion for ideas. In particular, the lecture explores the evolution of his thought about burning questions of the day: God and evil, the nature of humanity, and the value of the individual human being. The lecture also explores Belinskii's ideas, influenced by Western thought, about the dignity and rights of the individual and how these moral and philosophical ideas were used to critique serfdom, autocracy, and social injustice. The lecture concludes with a comparison of Westernizers and Slavophiles around the question of the individual person.

Outline

I. The larger of the two main movements in the emerging Russian intelligentsia was the Westernizers.

- **A.** Whereas the Slavophiles formed a relatively coherent intellectual trend, the Westernizers were more diffuse and varied.
- **B.** What united them was the belief that Russia's only hope—its only future—lay in joining the civilization of the West.

II. A remarkable individual who exemplified this emerging intelligentsia is Vissarion Belinskii (1811–1848).

- **A.** Unlike most of the other radicals of the 1830s and 1840s, who tended to be from the gentry, Belinskii was the son of a country doctor.
  - **1.** Later, many young radicals would come from the *raznochintsy* (people of various ranks—that is, not from any of the traditional estates: peasants, nobles, clergy).
  - **2.** Their origins mattered, for the *raznochintsy* stood sociologically apart from the traditional order, which encouraged them to imagine a society in which they had a proper place.
  - **3.** The fact that Belinskii was relatively underprivileged meant that he was less prepared intellectually than other leading *intelligenty* (for example, he could not read German).
  - **4.** But he made up for his educational deficits in emotional commitment and fervor.
- **B.** The essence of his intellectual style was embodied in the idea: "to think, to feel, to understand and to suffer are one and the same thing."
  - **1.** These sentiments were true to the Romantic ideal that real understanding comes, not from reason, but from intuitive insight.
  - **2.** This combination of thinking and feeling pervaded Belinskii's life.
  - **3.** Alexander Herzen, one of the leading Westernizers, tells of Belinskii's passion for honest conviction.
  - **4.** Belinskii was never lighthearted, and his search for "truth" was unrelenting, as recalled by his friend the writer Ivan Turgenev, who participated in a discussion with Belinskii over God's existence.
- **C.** To understand the culture of the entire intelligentsia, it is important to pay attention to this style and manner.
- **D.** All of this earnest passion was directed at ideas, but what were these ideas?

III. In a letter written just before his death, Belinskii noted three stages of his thought: God, humanity, man.

- **A.** Belinskii resolved the eternal question of the existence of evil in a world supposedly created by a good and omnipotent God (theodicy) by deciding that there can be no God.
- **B.** His second major intellectual struggle was how could one explain human evil?
  - **1.** Like other young, educated Russians of his generation, Belinskii was enamored with German idealistic philosophy, especially with the works of Schelling and Hegel, who argued that everything that exists in the world is an embodiment of the totality of all things—of a higher harmony.
  - **2.** Belinskii concluded that the correct philosophical response was to recognize that all is as it should be.
  - **3.** Belinskii interpreted Hegel's notion that "all that is real is rational" in a conservative way.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

4. Belinskii did not deny the evil of the real world, but he tried to philosophically accept this world.
5. After little more than a year, Belinskii found this intellectual position unbearable.
6. He escaped from this "reconciliation with reality" by relying on moral thought and feeling.

C. Belinskii now emphasized an ethical idea that was central to the emerging thought of the intelligentsia: the individual human being.
1. A key term here is *lichnost'* (the individual person, the human personality, the self).
2. Armed with this idea, Belinskii challenged much conventional philosophical thinking.
3. He also constructed a critique of the world around him—he criticized autocracy, serfdom, poverty, prostitution, drunkenness, wife-beating, and other evils of everyday Russian life

D. In 1847, in a letter Belinskii wrote to the writer Nikolai Gogol, we find the most famous and influential example of this social and moral criticism of the existing world.
1. Gogol had become famous as a writer of fiction in which he exposed the widespread corruption in Russian political and social life and expressed sympathy for the poor and downtrodden.
2. In 1847, Gogol shocked the Russian public by publishing *Selected Passages from a Correspondence with Friends*, in which he bluntly declared that national regeneration would come about through personal, inward transformation and submission to all established authority.
3. Belinskii responded, with moral outrage, that what Russia needed was for the people to awaken to their sense of human dignity and for there to be rights and laws that protected the person.
4. The dignity of the human person was the sole categorical imperative for Belinskii and the basis for needed political, social, and cultural change in Russia.

E. Belinskii's writings on literature were inseparable from these moral judgments.
1. What Belinskii required most of a work of literature was "truth."
2. For Belinskii, truth meant a probing portrayal of real life and a commitment to moral truth.
3. The backwardness and oppressiveness of Russian life, he argued, made literature and its moral and critical mission especially important.

IV. Rather than their attitudes toward the West or Russia, it was this idea of *lichnost'* (of the dignity of each individual) that truly divided Slavophiles from Westernizers.

A. The Slavophiles idealized a world in which people were all bonded together in a natural community (*sobornost'*).

B. The Westernizers idealized the individual and were concerned above all with the individual's rights and dignity in society

C. For many Westernizing *intelligenty*, this was a liberal idea, but it was also a socialist one, for socialism was seen as a social ideal meant to promote the individual.

Essential Reading:

Isaiah Berlin, *Russian Thinkers* (New York, 1995—or earlier editions).

Supplementary Reading:

James Edie, James Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, *Russian Philosophy* (Chicago, 1965), vol. 1, Book 3.

Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts* (Berkeley, 1999).

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A Parting of the Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855*.

Questions to Consider:

1. Why were Russian *intelligenty* so passionate (some would say obsessed) about philosophical ideas?
2. What were Belinskii's (and Westernizers') attitudes toward the individual person? Is this similar to Western notions of individuality?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Timeline

Note: Names of rulers are printed in bold.

1613	Founding of Romanov dynasty with election of Mikhail as tsar by notables
1645–1676	Reign of tsar **Aleksei**, father of Peter I
1649	First law code (*Ulozhenie*)
1652	Establishment of foreigners' settlement (*nemetskaia sloboda*) in Moscow
1653	Church reforms begin (leading to schism in 1666)
1676–1682	Tsar **Fedor**
1682–1689	**Peter I** and his half-brother **Ivan V** rule as co-tsars; Sofia is regent
1689–1725	**Peter I** reigns as tsar; major reforms and Westernization
1721	Peter named emperor and "the Great"
1697–1698	Peter's "grand embassy" to Holland and England
1700–1721	Northern War between Russia and Sweden
1703	Founding of St. Petersburg
1710	Conquest of the Baltic region
1722	Table of Ranks requires all nobles to earn rank through state service
1724	Establishment of Academy of Sciences
1725–1727	Rule of Peter's second wife, **Catherine I**
1727–1730	Rule of Peter I's grandson (through his first wife) **Peter II**
1730–1740	**Anna**, daughter of Ivan V, rules, abolishing the powerful Privy Council and reasserting autocracy
1736–1739	Russo-Turkish War
1740–1741	Reign of the infant **Ivan VI** (grandnephew of Anna) with mother as regent
1741–1761	Reign of **Elizabeth**, daughter of Peter I and Catherine I
1761–1762	**Peter III**; emancipates nobility from mandatory state service
1762–1796	**Catherine II the Great** (wife of Peter III)
1767	Legislative Commission formed to consider reform, guided by Catherine II's "Instructions" (*nakaz*)
1768–1774	Russo-Turkish War
1772	First Partition of Poland (complete 1794–1795)
1773–1775	Pugachev rebellion
1777	Nikolai Novikov begins publishing philosophical and moral journal, *Morning Light*
1785	Charter of the Nobility; Charter of the Towns
1787–1792	Russo-Turkish War
1792	Arrest and suppression of Novikov
1796–1801	**Paul I** (Catherine's son); tries to undo many of Catherine's reforms

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1797 ..... Law restores succession to throne by eldest son

1801–1825 ..... **Alexander I**; much discussion of reform

1805 ..... Russia participates in war against Napoleon

1809 ..... Acquisition of Finland

1810 ..... Establishment of State Council, appointed advisory body composed of Russia's oldest aristocratic families

1812 ..... Napoleon invades Russia; Battle of Borodino; burning of Moscow; French retreat

1814 ..... Victorious Russian troops enter Paris

1816 ..... Formation of the secret political society the Union of Salvation among discontented young nobles (succeeded by the Union of Welfare and the Northern and Southern Societies)

1824 ..... Serious flood in St. Petersburg

1825 ..... Decembrist revolt in the wake of the death of Alexander I

1825–1855 ..... **Nicholas I** (brother of Alexander I)

1826 ..... Hanging of five aristocratic leaders of the Decembrist revolt

1835 ..... First modern law code (*Svod zakonov*)

1836 ..... Publication of the first of Petr Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* (written in 1829)

1847 ..... Vissarion Belinskii writes famous letter to the writer Gogol

1853–1856 ..... Crimean War; defeat sparks talk of major reform

1855–1881 ..... **Alexander II**; the Great Reforms

1857–1862 ..... Herzen's journal *Kolokol* (*The Bell*) published in London

1861 ..... Emancipation of the serfs

1863 ..... University reform; publication of Nikolai Chernyshevskii's radical novel *What Is to Be Done?*

1864 ..... Establishment of local self-government (*zemstvo*); reform of the judicial system and of elementary education

1865 ..... Reform of censorship

1865–1885 ..... Conquest of Central Asia

1866 ..... Assassination attempt on Alexander II

1869 ..... Publication of Lev Tolstoy's *War and Peace*; separate Women's universities authorized

1869–1870 ..... Publication of Petr Lavrov's *Historical Letters*

1870 ..... Reform of city government

1874 ..... Culmination of military reform; populist "To the People" movement

1876–1879 ..... Populist organization Land and Freedom

1877–1878 ..... Russo-Turkish War in the Balkans

1878 ..... Religious transformation of the writer Lev Tolstoi

1879 ..... Land and Freedom splits into terrorist organization, People's Will, and propaganda-oriented Black Repartition

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1880	Count Loris-Melikov's "political spring" and plans to establish a consultative national assembly; Vladimir Solov'ev lectures on "Godmanhood" at St. Petersburg University
1881	Assassination of Alexander II by member of People's Will
1881–1894	**Alexander III**
1881–1884	Counter-reforms; "temporary regulations" created conditions of virtual martial law
1881–1882	Anti-Jewish pogroms, along with laws restricting Jewish settlement and employment
1891–1892	Famine
1891–1904	Building of Trans-Siberian Railway
1892–1903	Sergei Witte serves as Minister of Finance
1894–1917	**Nicholas II**
1895	Formation of Marxist St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class
1898	Founding of Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party
1901	Formation of populist Socialist Revolutionary Party; Tolstoi excommunicated for his religious views
1902	Publication of Vladimir Lenin's "What Is to Be Done?," the foundation text of Bolshevism
1903	Split in Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks
1904–1905	Russo-Japanese War
1904	Formation of first liberal party, the Union of Liberation
1905	Revolution of 1905: Bloody Sunday (January 9); mass strikes; October Manifesto promises political reform and civil rights; December insurrections
1906	Fundamental laws; first State Duma elected, critical of government, so closed; Prime Minister Stolypin's land reforms and policies of repression
1907	Second State Duma, also critical of government; government closes Duma and revises electoral law before allowing new elections
1912	Revival of labor unrest; legal publication begins of Bolshevik and Menshevik newspapers
1914	Outbreak of World War I
1916	Assassination of Rasputin
1917	February Revolution; establishment of Provisional Government and Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Soldier's Deputies; abdication of Nicholas II; Bolsheviks come to power and establish one-party government
1917–1924	**Vladimir Lenin**, chairman of Council of People's Commissars and de facto leader of Politburo of Communist Party
1918	Treaty of Brest-Litovsk removes Russia from war
1918–1921	Civil war; independence of Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, and Armenia
1921	Anti-Bolshevik Revolt at Kronstadt naval base near Petrograd
1921	Tenth Party Congress and promulgation of New Economic Policy

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1921–1922	Famine
1924	Death of V. I. Lenin; Petrograd renamed Leningrad
1920s	Debates and power struggles, out of which Stalin emerges as supreme party leader
1922–1953	**Iosif Stalin** general secretary of the Communist Party
1928	Beginning of first Five-Year Plan
1930	Mass collectivization of agriculture begins
1932–1933	Famine
1936–1939	Purges, show trials, and "great terror"
1939	Nazi-Soviet pact
1940	Annexation of Baltic states and war with Finland
1941	Nazi Germany invades USSR
1941–1953	Stalin also head of state (Chairman of Council of People's Commissars)
1941–1944	Siege of Leningrad
1944–1945	Soviet armies move into Eastern Europe and Germany
1953	Death of Stalin
1953–1964	**Nikita Khrushchev** first secretary of the Communist Party
1956	Khrushchev's "secret speech" denouncing Stalin delivered at Twentieth Party Congress
1962	Publication of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*
1962	Cuban missile crisis
1964	Nikita Khrushchev removed from power
1964–1982	**Leonid Brezhnev** first secretary (later renamed general secretary) of Communist Party
1974	Solzhenitsyn deported from Soviet Union
1975	Andrei Sakharov awarded Nobel Peace Prize
1979–1989	Soviet war in Afghanistan
1980	Andrei Sakharov exiled to Gor'kii
1982–1984	**Iurii Andropov** general secretary of the Communist Party
1984–1985	**Konstantin Chernenko** general secretary of the Communist Party
1985–1991	**Mikhail Gorbachev** general secretary of the Communist Party, beginning policy of restructuring and allowing greater freedom
1989	Opening of new elected Congress of People's Deputies of USSR
1990	Russian Federation declares sovereignty; Boris Yeltsin elected first Russian president; Gorbachev becomes president of USSR
1991	Attempted coup against Gorbachev by conservative Communists; Boris Yeltsin elected president of Russian Federation; declarations of independence by many Soviet states; USSR dissolved

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Glossary

Autocracy (*samoderzhavie*). Meaning literally and in its original sense, self-sustained or independent power, the term increasingly referred to the absolute authority of the Russian tsars, who were known as autocrats. Adapted in the fifteenth century from Byzantine ideas of imperial authority, it signified that there was no higher earthly authority than the Russian ruler.

Bolsheviks. Members of a wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which, led by Lenin, took control of the government in Russia in October 1917. The group originated at the party's second congress in 1903 when Lenin's followers, insisting that party membership be restricted to professional revolutionaries, won a temporary majority on the party's central committee and on the editorial board of its newspaper, *Iskra*. They assumed the name Bolsheviks ("those of the majority") and called their opponents the Mensheviks ("those of the minority"). The Bolsheviks insisted on a highly centralized, disciplined, professional party flexible enough to act boldly when the historical situation warranted. The Bolsheviks became a de facto independent party after 1912 and were renamed the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1918.

Boyars. Old Russian aristocrats who were the dominant social group in medieval Russian society and state administration. The social and political importance of the *boyars* declined in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Peter I abolished the rank and title of *boyar*, although the term was sometimes used archaically to refer to old aristocratic families.

Cheka (ChK, VChK, Vecheka). The All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the Struggle against Counterrevolution and Sabotage. Established 7 (20) December 1917, its role combined fighting banditry, looting, and financial corruption with the tasks of a political police. During 1918, a network of provincial and district Chekas was established. During the civil war, the Cheka was the primary organ of the "red terror." It was replaced by the OGPU and, in later years, by the NKVD and the KGB.

Council of People's Commissars. See ***Sovnarkom***.

Duma. A national representative assembly established in 1906. Empowered to initiate and approve legislation, though limited in its authority. Day-to-day political power remained in the hands of the ministers, whom the tsar appointed and who were not responsible to the Duma. The tsar could veto legislation, as could the parliamentary upper house of notables, the State Council, half of whose members were appointed by the tsar. Much of the budget (especially military and foreign policy) was not under the Duma's control. In 1907, the voting law was changed to reduce representation by the peasantry, urban workers, and national minorities and to increase that of the gentry.

Glasnost'. A Russian word that literally means openness, making things public and visible, this term was used to define Russian state policies of reform in two periods. During the Great Reforms of Alexander II, the policy of *glasnost'* involved open discussions of the coming reforms, a new system of jury trials open to the public, and censorship reform. Under Mikhail Gorbachev, the policy of *glasnost'* meant a greater freedom of information and of public discussion about problems in Soviet life, both past and present.

Groznyi. A Russian term, used to describe the traits of Russian rulers, meaning awesome, stern, severe, formidable, terrible, menacing, or dread. Ivan the Terrible (Ivan Groznyi, whose name is sometimes translated as Ivan the Dread) was titled with this term, but it was also used to refer to other powerful Russian tsars. It indicated the tsar's might and awesome power, traditional traits of the ideal ruler in the Russian political tradition. See also ***tishaishii***.

Gulag. A Russian acronym standing for the Main Directorate for Corrective Labor Camps (*Glavnoe upravlenie ispravitel'no-trudovykh lagerei*). In the Soviet Union, this was the name of a department of the NKVD, the Soviet political police, responsible between 1934 and 1955 for the administration of corrective labor camps and prisons. Many political prisoners were sent to these camps and often died there, especially in the Stalinist years. After the department was renamed, the term continued to be used to refer to the Soviet prison camp system generally.

Intelligentsia. A Russian term, now widely used in other languages, denoting a class of people devoted to critical thought and intellectual activity. Arising in the early nineteenth century, though the term itself came into regular use only in the 1860s, the Russian intelligentsia was not so much a social category (a class or occupational group) as a cultural one. It indicated not merely an educated person or a professional, nor even all people who shared an interest in ideas. An *intelligent*—the singular (pronounced with a hard "g")—was a person distinguished by a particular intellectual orientation: a stance in opposition to a repressive and restrictive political and social order, commitment

to serving others (especially "the people"), commitment to the cause of "truth," and a spirit of mission and consecration to a cause.

Kolkhoz. An acronym for the Russian *kollektivnoe khoziaistvo*, meaning collective farm. These began to emerge in the 1920s, but were most widespread after Stalin's forced collectivization in the early 1930s.

Kruzhki (singular, *kruzhok*). A Russian word meaning circles. Formed among students, intellectuals, political radicals, workers, dissidents, and others, *kruzhki* were informal, and sometimes illegal, gatherings where ideas were discussed and information and opinions were shared. They were most important for the intelligentsia in the nineteenth century and dissidents in the late Soviet period.

Kulak. Literally meaning "fist," this Russian term of contempt was popularly used by peasants to describe relatively well-to-do farmers, traders, millers, and others. In 1929, on the eve of massive forced collectivization of the peasantry, Stalin decreed "liquidation of *kulaks* as a class." Many richer farmers—and many who were not so wealthy—were violently expropriated and often arrested and sent to prison or into exile.

Lichnost'. A Russian term meaning person, personality, individual, or self, this term denoted not simply the individual or a person, but a person's inward human essence, which made each person naturally deserving of respect and freedom. This concept was especially widespread among Russia's intelligentsia—from Novikov to Soviet dissidents—among whom it had become an article of faith that one of the most essential and fundamental rights was "the right to live as a human being" and that a just social and political order was one that promoted the freedom and dignity of the human person.

Mensheviks. Members of the non-Leninist wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which evolved into a separate party. It originated when a dispute over party membership requirements arose at the 1903 congress of the Social-Democratic Party. One group, led by Iulii Martov, opposed Lenin's plan for a party restricted to professional revolutionaries and called for a more open mass party. They disagreed with the Bolsheviks' emphasis on the vanguard role of a highly centralized party of professional revolutionaries. They also believed that Russia first needed a liberal democratic revolution, which the proletariat could not and should not dominate, before the preconditions could be established for building socialism. Hence, in 1917, they were willing to work with the bourgeois Left in the Provisional Government to establish a democratic but not socialist society. After 1917, they attempted to form a legal opposition but were suppressed. Many went into exile. See also **Bolsheviks**.

Mir or ***obshchina***. Russian terms for the traditional peasant commune in Russia, which lasted until collectivization in 1930. This institution of the heads of households of a rural community (often a village but sometimes several small settlements combined) served both peasant interests and those of landlords and the state—especially after emancipation—though a variety of functions: collecting taxes, managing community law and order and punishment, dealing with outsiders, organizing field work, and periodically redistributing peasant plots to ensure that the size of the plot was appropriate to family needs and capacities. The peasant commune was much romanticized by populists as a sign of natural peasant socialism.

Narod. A Russian term meaning the common people—especially peasants—but also the nation. For most educated Russians (including government officials), from the late eighteenth century until at least the 1940s, to talk about the common people was to talk about Russia's essential nature and identity as a nation.

Nationality (*narodnost'*). One of the three key terms, along with autocracy and Orthodoxy, in the statement of Russian autocratic political ideology that was first made explicit in the 1830s. The concept of nationality referred to the distinctive character and personality of the Russian nation, especially as manifested in its common people (*narod*). Above all, this meant the Russian people's devoted love of autocratic authority.

NEP. In 1921, Lenin initiated the New Economic Policy, which lasted until the end of the 1920s. A departure from the radically centralizing policies of the civil war, which tried to create a socialist economy by central directive, the NEP era can be seen (and was seen by various people) as either a temporary retreat or an original strategy for building socialism through gradualism, education, and a mixed economy. This latter view was strongly associated with Nikolai Bukharin. Under NEP, peasants were allowed to market grain and other products, and private retail trade and small-scale industry was restored (creating a class of small traders and manufacturers known as Nepmen). The state retained control of heavy industry, transport, banking, and foreign trade. Many workers and radicals were discontented with what they saw as the social and ideological compromises of NEP.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Nomenklatura. A Russian term for the list of government and managerial elites appointed by higher party and state organs during the later Soviet years. The term was often used as a shorthand to refer to the whole class of privileged Soviet officials.

Obshchina. See ***mir***.

Okhrana. A Russian acronym for *okhrannoe otdelenie*, or security department, the Okhrana was the political police in late Imperial Russia. Established in 1881 after the assassination of Alexander II, its task was to maintain the security of the state and suppress revolutionary activities. It was disbanded in 1917.

Orthodoxy (*pravoslavie*). The majority religion of Russia, Russian Orthodoxy is a branch of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Introduced from Byzantium, it became the official religion of Russia by state decree in 988. The Russian term *pravoslavie* (which means the correct way to worship and glorify God) underscores the central importance in Russian Christianity of liturgy, ritual, and prayer.

Perestroika. A Russian word meaning restructuring, *perestroika* was a policy under Mikhail Gorbachev of political and economic renewal of the socialist system. An attempt to make Soviet socialism work, it involved economic reforms that would encourage greater initiative and responsiveness to the market to revitalize a stagnant economy. It also involved political reforms, especially multicandidate elections, that would encourage more public engagement and, it was hoped, overcome widespread political disenchantment and even cynicism.

Politburo. Acronym for Political Bureau, this was the supreme policy-making body of the Communist party. In 1919, in place of a single Central Committee, three new bureaus were created alongside an expanded Central Committee: the policy-making Politburo, headed by Lenin; the administrative Organizational Bureau (Orgburo); and the supporting Secretariat. Because the Secretariat planned the agenda, provided all documentation for debate, and transmitted Politburo decisions to the lower echelons, the general secretary of the party (later called first secretary) became, after Lenin's death, the Politburo's most influential member and, hence, the Soviet leader.

Populism (*narodnichestvo*). The predominant ideology on the Russian Left from the 1870s until the 1890s, when many were attracted to Marxism, though it remained a strong influence through the 1917 revolution. Nineteenth-century populists believed that capitalism would not improve the lives of the common people and that Russia had a special historical opportunity to avoid the evils of capitalism and create a socialist society because of the unique Russian peasant commune with its traditions of collective ownership and collective responsibility. No less important, populists were characterized by a strong moral passion for justice. In the 1870s, populists differed over strategy and tactics (especially on the question of terrorism) and formed different groups, notably People's Will (*Narodnaia volia*), which favored terror, and Black Repartition (*Chernyi peredel*), which focused more on education and propaganda. The Socialist Revolutionary party, which formed in 1901, was heir to these populist traditions. In the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November 1917, the SRs won a plurality of votes, revealing strong support among peasants.

Pravda. A Russian word meaning truth, law, and justice. The term was used by Decembrists in the early 1800s as the title for one of their programs for the political and social reform of Russia. In 1912, *Pravda* was chosen as the name of the Bolshevik party newspaper.

Rechtsstaat. A German concept, widely discussed as an goal in nineteenth-century Russia, especially during the reign of Alexander I, to denote a state in which the rule of law predominates rather than the personal will of the monarch or his officials.

Samizdat. A Russian term, an abbreviation of self-publishing house (*samoizdatel'stvo*), created by Soviet dissidents, especially in the 1960s and after, to refer to unofficial texts, ranging from poetry to works of history, reproduced by hand or on individual typewriters, often using carbon paper, and passed from hand to hand. A related form, sometimes called ***tamizdat*** (literally, published "there" [*tam*]), were publications printed in Western Europe and the United States, then smuggled back into the country.

Slavophiles (*slavianofily*). Members of an intellectual movement, primarily from the 1830s through the 1850s, that wanted Russia's future development to be based on values and institutions derived from the country's history before the Westernizing reforms of Peter the Great. They believed that these national traditions, especially a communal spirit, still survived most strongly among the common people. A central principle was the ideal of *sobornost'*. Although they looked to the past for inspiration, they were not conservative. They criticized much of the existing

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

political and social order in Russia, in particular, serfdom and the lack of civil rights and liberties. See also **Westernizers**.

Sobornost'. The central ideal of the Slavophiles, most fully elaborated by Aleksei Khomiakov. Usually translated as "conciliarity," *sobornost'* is more accurately (if loosely) translated as "spiritual community." It is the ideal of a society existing as a community (in natural, harmonious relationships), united by free will on the basis of shared Christian values.

Soviets. Councils of deputies elected by urban workers and soldiers, but also including representatives of leftist parties, trade unions, and other organizations. Ranged in scale from neighborhood soviets in large cities to citywide and regional soviets. First established during the 1905 revolution, they arose again in Petrograd in February 1917, followed by most Russian cities. The Petrograd Soviet, which shared the Tauride Palace with the Provisional Government and, especially, its Executive Committee, functioned as a national representative of workers and soldiers. The First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, in early June 1917, established the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets (VTsIK), which functioned in the same way. After October 1917, the Congress of Soviets, and the VTsIK between sessions, was formally the supreme organ of state power.

Sovnarkom (*Sovet narodnykh komissarov*). Council of People's Commissars. Established 26 October (8 November) 1917, replacing the Council of Ministers of the tsarist and Provisional governments. Headed by Vladimir Lenin until his death in 1924. The Sovnarkom was the executive and administrative branch of the Soviet government, formally subordinate to the legislative authority of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets, though in practice, the dominant structure of state power.

Stakhanovism. A campaign for increasing industrial production through a mixture of labor enthusiasm and more efficient work. Begun in 1935, it was named for Aleksei Stakhanov, a coal miner in the Donets basin, whose team increased its daily output sevenfold by organizing a more efficient division of labor and by working with increased intensity. Stakhanovites were offered higher pay and other privileges.

Tishaishii. A Russian term used to describe the traits of Russian rulers, literally meaning most quiet or most gentle. Officially, it was the epithet applied to tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, Peter the Great's father, but it was used to refer to other tsars as well. In the Russian political tradition, it expressed the ideas of religious piety and love for the people that were considered some of the ideal traits of the ruler. See also ***groznyi***.

Tsar. The title of the Russian monarch starting with Ivan IV ("the Terrible") in 1547. Before then, Russian rulers had been called grand princes. Peter the Great renamed the ruler emperor, but tsar was still commonly used. Adapted from the Latin title Caesar, the term identified the Russian ruler as an emperor and was one of many symbols of authority borrowed from Rome and Byzantium. Tsar is often spelled czar in English, though this does not follow modern transliteration systems.

Tsar-batiushka. A Russian term meaning tsar-father. This was a popular expression of affection used especially by peasants to express their love of the tsar and their certainty that he cared for and protected them.

Westernizers (*zapadniki*). Members of an intellectual movement, primarily from the 1830s through the 1850s, that emphasized Russia's common historic destiny with the West, as opposed to Slavophiles, who looked to Russia's traditions before Westernization for inspiration. Leading Westernizers included Alexander Herzen and Vissarion Belinskii. A central principle for them was the individual person (*lichnost'*) and his or her natural rights and dignity. Many Westernizers became socialists, seeing in socialism the most advanced Western ideas and the best means of promoting the welfare and happiness of the individual.

Zemstvos. Provincial rural assemblies established in 1864. Representatives were elected by the local population; peasants were included, but their representation was weighted so that larger landowners would be predominant. Also included members appointed by the state. Hired professionals, often liberal in their politics, played an increasingly large role. Responsible for education, road building, health care, and improvement of agricultural techniques, the *zemstvos* became organizing centers for Russian liberalism and sources of demands for a more representative national government.

Zhenotdel. The Women's Department of the Central Committee of the Russian (later Soviet) Communist Party existed from 1919 until it was closed by Stalin in 1930. It was designed to mobilize women to improve their lives, focusing on issues of child care, public health, education, literacy, housing, and the family, including the problem of male alcoholism and wife and child abuse. The Zhenotdel promoted public laundries, bath houses, and cafeterias to

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

alleviate the burdens of individual housework. The program of the Zhenotdel derived from the fundamental socialist ideal of social equality.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

A History of Russia:
From Peter the Great to Gorbachev
Part II

Professor Mark D. Steinberg

THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

Mark D. Steinberg, Ph.D.

Professor of History, Director of the Russian and East European Center, University of Illinois

Mark Steinberg completed his undergraduate work at the University of California at Santa Cruz in 1978 and received his Ph.D. in European history at the University of California at Berkeley in 1987. He taught Russian and European history at the University of Oregon (1987), Harvard University (1987–1989), and Yale University (1989–1996) before joining the faculty at the University of Illinois, at its main campus in Urbana-Champaign, in 1996. Since 1998, Professor Steinberg has also been the Director of the Russian and East European Center at Illinois, an interdisciplinary program designated by the Department of Education as a national resource center.

Professor Steinberg has received many awards for his teaching, including the Sarai Ribicoff Prize for Teaching at Yale University (1993) and, at Illinois, the George and Gladys Queen Excellence in History Teaching Award (1998 and 2002) and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (2002). For his work as a scholar, he has received numerous prestigious fellowships, including from the International Research and Exchanges Board, the Social Science Research Council, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Smithsonian Institution, the Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In 2001, the University of Illinois gave him one of its highest honors and named him a University Scholar.

Professor Steinberg has published many articles, delivered numerous papers at national and international conferences, given public lectures throughout the country, and served on several national professional committees and editorial boards. He specializes in the cultural, intellectual, and social history of Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His first book, published in 1992, was a study of the relations among employers, managers, and workers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, entitled *Moral Communities*. In 1994, Professor Steinberg co-edited *Cultures in Flux*, an influential collection of essays on Russian lower-class cultures. In 1995, he published, together with a Russian archivist, *The Fall of the Romanovs*, which examines the fate of the tsar and his family during the revolution and includes translations of documents from then recently opened Russian archives. In 2001, Professor Steinberg published *Voices of Revolution, 1917*, a study and collection of translated documents exploring the revolution through contemporary letters and other writings by ordinary Russians. His most recent book, *Proletarian Imagination*, published in 2002, explores poetry and other writings by lower-class Russians in the years before and after 1917, focusing on ideas about self, modern times, and the sacred. He is currently working on a collection of essays on religion in Russia, a revised textbook on Russian history, and a study of St. Petersburg in the late 1800s and early 1900s.

Professor Steinberg is a native of San Francisco and is married to Jane Hedges, an editor and translator. Further information can be found at his Web site: http://www.history.uiuc.edu/steinb/index.htm.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Table of Contents

A History of Russia: From Peter the Great to Gorbachev Part II

Professor Biography i

Course Scope 1

Lecture Thirteen	Alexander II and the Great Reforms	2
Lecture Fourteen	"Nihilists"	5
Lecture Fifteen	Populists and Marxists	8
Lecture Sixteen	Paths to Revolution—Lenin and Martov	11
Lecture Seventeen	Lev Tolstoy	14
Lecture Eighteen	The Reign of Alexander III	17
Lecture Nineteen	Nicholas II, the Last Tsar	19
Lecture Twenty	The Revolution of 1905	21
Lecture Twenty-One	Peasant Life and Culture	24
Lecture Twenty-Two	The Modern City and Its Discontents	26
Lecture Twenty-Three	Fin-de-Siècle Culture—Decadence and Iconoclasm	28
Lecture Twenty-Four	Fin-de-Siècle Culture—The Religious Renaissance	30

Biographical Notes 33

Please refer to Part I for the timeline and glossary and Part III for the annotated bibliography.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

A History of Russia: From Peter the Great to Gorbachev

Scope:

After a discussion of background issues (geography, multi-ethnicity, the problem of backwardness, Europeanization), the course begins with politics and culture on the eve of Peter the Great's efforts to transform his country, then looks at Peter and his reforms. Next, women's rule in eighteenth-century Russia is examined, with a particular focus on the reigns of Elizabeth (Peter the Great's daughter) and Catherine the Great. Turning toward society, two additional lectures on the eighteenth century follow: on the Pugachev uprising and the growing critique of autocratic despotism by educated Russians, especially the publisher and writer Nikolai Novikov. Lecture Seven begins the nineteenth century by returning to a focus on the state and the monarch: Paul I and especially Alexander I, who seriously discussed possible reform. We also look at the Decembrist rebellion, in which educated nobles took arms against the state to bring about social and political reform. Next, we consider Nicholas I and the ideas about power and order that inspired the Russian state at that time. Returning the gaze to society, the course then offers lectures on different intellectuals' visions of change: the "national poet" Alexander Pushkin (whom we consider also for what his image as a symbol of the Russian nation tells us) and the full-fledged emergence of the "intelligentsia" in the 1830s and 1840s. Particular attention is paid to their ideas about Russia, the West, and the meanings of freedom.

Lecture Thirteen begins the history of the Great Reforms under Alexander II, which sought to create a modern society in Russia though dramatic reform. We then examine dissident trends and the individuals associated with them: nihilism (including terrorism), populism, Marxism (including the emergence of Bolshevism). For a different voice, we look at the famous writer Lev Tolstoy, especially his life and his arguments about morality and conscience. Returning our gaze to official Russia, we highlight the lives, personalities, and outlooks of the last two tsars, Alexander III and his son Nicholas II. We then consider a decisive event in the reign of Nicholas: the strikes, demonstrations, and public demands that the tsarist government accept civil rights and democratic rule in Russia in 1905. To see Russia's changes in larger perspective, we look at peasant life and culture in the late 1800s and early 1900s, life in the changing cities (especially for workers and the middle class) from the industrialization drive of the 1890s to the eve of World War I, and at aspects of what might be called *fin-de-siècle* culture: decadence in everyday life and in the arts, cultural iconoclasm, and the religious renaissance.

Lecture Twenty-Five examines the Russian experience in World War I and the coming of revolution. It is followed with an examination of the Russian experience in the key months from the fall of the tsarist government in February to the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in October, then by a lecture on the Bolsheviks during their first year in power. The story of the Civil War comes next, followed by a discussion of the debates in the 1920s in the Soviet Union over how to overcome Russia's backwardness and build socialism. Next, we look at Joseph Stalin's biography and political personality, the era of radical industrialization and social transformation that he launched at the end of the 1920s, and the contradictory political, social, and cultural life of the 1930s (including the Great Terror). We turn then to the Soviet experience in World War II and to politics and the experiences of Soviet people during the decades after the war and before Gorbachev's reforms. Continuing the theme of exploring dissent, we look at some of the various forms of alienation from, and resistance to, the Soviet system during the years before Gorbachev came to power (both everyday forms and open dissidence). Finally, we look at Mikhail Gorbachev's recognition of the many problems of the system and his efforts to make Communism work though a policy of reform. The final lecture concludes with a consideration of the situation left in the wake of the collapse of Communism.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirteen
Alexander II and the Great Reforms

Scope: This lecture considers the efforts by the state, under Alexander II, to create a modern society in Russia through dramatic reform but also the state's anxiety about reform. The lecture begins with the catastrophic failure in the Crimean War and the death of Nicholas I. Made painfully aware by the war of Russia's backwardness, the new tsar embarked on a major series of reforms: abolition of serfdom and the reform of major institutions. Asking what the purposes and meaning of these reforms were, the lecture first considers the political personality of Alexander II, especially the persistent desire to balance power and progress, order and change. These contradictory goals are seen reflected in the reforms. The lecture concludes with a discussion of the political crisis at the end of Alexander II's reign—including failure in war, the rise of terrorism, and peasant unrest—and plans for further reform, cut short by the assassination of the tsar himself.

Outline

I. By the mid-1800s, generations of Russians had been talking about the need for various reforms.
- **A.** The desire was for what might be called "modernizing reforms" that would strengthen the state and the country and bring Russia more into accord with the values seen throughout Europe as "civilized."
- **B.** Yet the fear of change repeatedly caused the government to pull back from reformist causes.
  - **1.** We saw these anxieties during the reigns of Catherine II and Alexander I.
  - **2.** Although Nicholas I recognized the need for reform, even the abolition of serfdom, his fear of the risks was greater than ever.

II. Two events changed this calculus of risk and benefit: the death of Nicholas I in 1855 and the Crimean War.
- **A.** Liberals and radicals were happy about the death of Nicholas I; even many conservatives had found his reign to be stifling.
- **B.** Russia's defeat in the Crimean War (1854–1856) made the country's backwardness clear.

III. In 1855, Alexander II (1855–1871) inherited the throne and the failing war, quickly conceded defeat, and set out on a course of major reform.
- **A.** Serfdom was abolished in 1861 (to take effect in 1863).
  - **1.** Serf owners were in a state of shock and disbelief.
  - **2.** Serfs, after initial doubts and before later disappointment, were enthusiastic.
- **B.** In 1863, the university statute made universities more autonomous.
- **C.** Municipal reform in 1870, creating city councils, similarly increased self-government in the cities.
- **D.** In 1864, a much more open and regularized judicial system was created, along with a new a system of jury trials that were open to the public (in accordance with the new principle of *glasnost'*, or openness).
- **E.** In 1865, a reform of press laws replaced preliminary censorship with judicial punishment after the fact.
- **F.** The 1874 military reform restructured the army on a modern European model.

IV. What did these dramatic and important reforms mean to the tsar and his advisers and to the larger society?
- **A.** Let us first examine the political personality of Alexander himself.
  - **1.** Every indication is that he was neither a bold reformer nor strongly attached to tradition for its own sake.
  - **2.** We can see a fair measure of ambivalence and uncertainty in his policies: He chose ministers that were often opposed to one another, and his policies fluctuated between reform and efforts to limit the effects of reform.
- **B.** When we look closely at the reforms and statements by reformers, we see a unifying goal: strengthen the power of the country and the government, improve military preparedness, and enhance Russia's authority as a strong, modern nation.
- **C.** This modernization had two sides.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. On the one hand, we see the desire to create a state based on regular procedures and the rule of law and to free people to become active citizens.
2. On the other hand, we see a concern to preserve the power and security of the state that brought about these changes.
3. Taken together, the goal was to balance power and progress, order and change.

V. To understand this balancing act, it is useful to look more closely at the reforms themselves.

A. In the planning stages of the emancipation, we see this balance.
1. Discussions and decisions of the state were published and widely disseminated for discussion (*glasnost'*).
2. At the same time, Alexander ordered the police to monitor discussions, and overly critical voices were silenced.

B. The emancipation reform itself similarly tried to balance change and order.
1. Freed serfs received land to prevent the danger of landlessness.
2. To maintain the strength of the gentry, landlords were allowed to keep a large part of the land.
3. Restrictions on movement made it difficult for peasants to leave the village without the permission of the commune.

C. Other reforms show a similar balancing act.
1. In the *zemstvo* reform, although all social groups were to be involved, the participation was weighted to ensure that the landowners were predominant and government appointees were included.
2. Although the university statute made universities more autonomous, student rights to organize were ended and faculty members were prevented from being involved in public political activity.
3. Preliminary censorship was abolished for most books and journals under press reform, but punishments remained common against publishers and writers who criticized the government too directly or harshly.

D. This attempt to combine reform with control over the consequences of reform proved counterproductive.
1. The liberal-minded, who wanted more, were frustrated by the limits.
2. Peasants were disappointed that they did not get all the land they worked, and they had to pay for the land they received.
3. At the same time, the success of the reforms helped to create groups with increasing independence, who would eventually challenge the status quo (such as members of *zemstvos* and city councils and the growing class of independent professionals).

VI. In the years 1879–1881, a major political crisis erupted, partly as a result of the contradictions of reform.

A. The failure of the Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878) provided the context and stimulus for crisis.
1. Russia actually won this Balkan war on the battlefield.
2. But Russia's victory frightened Western European leaders, who forced Russia back to the bargaining table, where the spoils of victory were taken away.

B. There was renewed peasant unrest in the late 1870s, caused by both disappointment over the results of the emancipation and immediate economic problems.

C. The third element of the crisis was a growing terrorist movement by radical youths against officials and even the tsar.

D. Facing a clear political crisis, the government intensified its characteristic approach: combine reform and repression.
1. The key figure in this new policy was Count Mikhail Loris-Melikov, minister of the interior and head of the Imperial Police Department.
2. Loris-Melikov saw his task as twofold: restoring order (with force when necessary) and introducing needed reforms.
3. He attempted to win the support of moderate public opinion by some modest immediate reforms and the more radical proposal that a consultative national assembly be established.
4. Loris-Melikov's proposal was signed into law on March 1, 1881.
5. However, Alexander II was killed a few hours later by a bomb thrown by revolutionaries of the People's Will.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

6. Alexander III renounced Loris-Melikov's plan.

Essential Reading:

W. Bruce Lincoln, *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, 1990).

Supplementary Reading:

Ben Eklof, John Bushnell, and Larissa Zakharova, eds., *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855–1881* (Bloomington, 1994).

W. Bruce Lincoln, *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats, 1825–1861* (DeKalb, 1982).

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in the Russian Monarchy* (Princeton, 2000), vol. 2, chapters 1–4.

Questions to Consider:

1. How important was the goal of democracy in Alexander II's "Great Reforms"? What did democracy mean to these reformers, if anything?
2. What ideas of "citizen" and "citizenship" were visible in the Great Reforms?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Fourteen
"Nihilists"

Scope: This lecture returns to the continued growth of dissent by educated Russians. The focus is on something new: an organized student movement starting in the 1860s and the appearance of a new type of intelligent, the "nihilist," whose criticisms of tradition seemed so uncompromising as to be a rejection of everything. The lecture looks at new conditions in the universities under Alexander II, then turns to the student movement. It explores student organizing, conflicts with authorities, and the emergence of terrorism beside strategies of education. The lecture seeks to understand what motivated these students by looking at a number of proclamations. It then turns to the influential ideas of Nikolai Chernyshevsky and considers the relative importance of scientific rationalism and moral passion in his ideas. The lecture concludes by looking at what might be called "nihilist style"—patterns of dress, manner, and lifestyle and what these tell us about the nihilists' ideals and values.

Outline

I. The period of the Great Reforms during the 1860s brought an important new development in the history of the intelligentsia: an organized student movement and a new type of young, educated Russian—the "nihilist."

A. The reforms of Alexander II helped set the stage for this student movement.

1. Immediately after ascending the throne, Alexander II created freer conditions in Russia's universities.

2. These reforms helped encourage increased enrollment (of men) and the social diversity of the student body (greater numbers of non-nobles).

3. In addition, people's expectations were raised and their imaginations, stimulated.

B. These freer conditions did not make the universities less dangerous, however. Instead, they now became centers of organized rebellion.

1. Students organized mutual assistance societies, libraries, and newspapers and began holding mass meetings and even demonstrations.

2. Once organized, they began to exercise their power within the university, especially by mobilizing against teachers they did not like.

3. Sometimes, students directly confronted police, as in the violent clash between students and police in Kazan in 1857.

4. In 1861, the government issued the restrictive "May Rules" to try to stem student activism.

5. Students responded in the fall by staging illegal mass meetings, street demonstrations, and strikes; issuing manifestoes; and engaging in violent clashes with the police.

C. It is important to recognize that this student movement was not isolated.

1. Educated adults sympathized with and financially supported the students.

2. The students, in turn, "accepted all this as a proper tribute for our behavior."

D. This movement continued throughout the 1860s.

E. Although most of these students focused their efforts on self-education and the education of others, in the mid-1860s, a minority turned to terrorism.

1. By assassinating government officials, they hoped to inspire a revolution.

2. In 1866, Dmitrii Karakozov, a member of a Petersburg organization named "Hell," attempted to assassinate Alexander II.

3. There would be many attempts on the tsar's life before he was assassinated in 1881.

4. The result of these attacks, though, was often to inspire sympathy for the monarchy and contempt for revolutionaries.

II. One way of discovering what motivated these young Russians is to examine some of the hundreds of manifestoes and pamphlets that appeared in 1861–1862.

A. A relatively moderate statement was titled "Great Russia"—it called for wider reforms, a constitution, and freedom for Poland.

B. More radical was "To the Young Generation."

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. It argued that the only vital forces in Russia were the peasants, the intelligentsia, and the students.
2. The monarchy, it said, should be replaced by a republic based on the peasant commune.
3. Though the nihilists' economic ideal was vague, they favored some sort of socialist cooperative ownership and work.

C. The most radical proposal was "Young Russia," written in 1862 by Petr Zaichnevskii, who had been expelled from Moscow University.
1. Russia was to be a decentralized federation, with much local political authority.
2. Peasant communes and communally run factories were to organize production.
3. In addition, education was to be free, there was to be equality for women, and all nationalities were to have the right to secede from Russia if they wished.
4. The violent methods proposed and the arguments about elite leadership of the new order echoed French Jacobinism and foreshadowed Leninism.

D. Proclamations like "Young Russia" not only alarmed the government, but also alienated liberal society.
1. This sense of alarm was reinforced by a series of suspicious fires in St. Petersburg in the early summer of 1862.
2. Many blamed the radical students.
3. Many considered one man, the radical journalist Nikolai Chernyshevskii, indirectly responsible.
4. In the hope of stopping the movement, Chernyshevskii was arrested in July 1862 and sentenced to prison and exile.

III. Chernyshevskii's ideas were quite influential and can help us understand the motivations and ideas of these students.

A. He advocated the usual list of ideals that Russians were beginning to think of as socialism: communal economic forms, equality and emancipation of women, civil rights, and democratic government.

B. The philosophical basis of his socialism was "rational egoism."
1. The "egoism" stemmed from the belief that individual needs and individual happiness must form the basis for all morality and, hence, for society.
2. The "rational egoist" recognizes that everyone must be an egoist—and respects others' needs as equal to his own.
3. In other words, the "rational egoist" sees that his self-interest lies in the well-being of all humankind and, thus, in cooperation, not competition.

C. Thus, Chernyshevskii came to the same conclusions as Belinskii and other Westernizers in placing the individual at the center of concern.
1. But Chernyshevskii treated these ideals as a product of rationalism and utilitarianism, not moralism.
2. However, in many respects, Chernyshevskii and his followers were also inspired by a moral point of view.

IV. To deepen this examination of these students, it is useful to consider their manner, style, and behavior.

A. In their dress, male and female nihilists deliberately defied convention.

B. Their manners were similarly defiant and uninhibited.

C. Many young nihilists favored communal living, with, in theory, complete equality between classes and genders.

D. Young nihilists were trying to become, following Chernyshevskii's advice, "new people."
1. Their efforts were fueled by reasoned thought.
2. However, their vision of change was also fed by moral passion, desire, and imagination.

Essential Reading:

Franco Venturi, *The Roots of Revolution* (London, 2001).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Nikolai Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?* (Ithaca, 1989).

Abbott Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (New York, 1980).

Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior* (Stanford, 1988).

Questions to Consider:

1. Did the "nihilists," as this term was meant to suggest, reject all established beliefs and moral principles?
2. What were student radicals trying to accomplish with their alternative lifestyles? What does it mean to create a "new person"?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Fifteen
Populists and Marxists

Scope: This lecture examines two major intellectual and political movements that emerged in the final decades of the nineteenth century: populism (*narodnichestvo*) and Marxism. After considering the standard definitions of populism, the lecture looks more deeply at the guiding ideas and values by considering the writings of leading populist thinkers, especially Petr Lavrov, whose works reveal the centrality of moral vision and concern with human welfare and the individual person. The lecture next examines the famous "to the people" movement of the summer of 1874 and responses to its failure, including the rise of terrorism as a political and social strategy. The lecture concludes by considering the early history of Marxism in Russia and the reasons for its emergence as a response to disappointments with populism. Attention is focused on ideas about capitalism and the peasantry and on the deterministic logic of Marxism.

Outline

I. By the 1870s, nihilism gave way to what was termed "populism" (*narodnichestvo*).

A. Populism became the dominant ideology on the Russian left, and even many liberals were influenced by its ideas.

B. Populism's popularity was one of many signs of the continuing and deepening "parting of the ways" between educated society and the monarchical state.

II. What was Russian populism?

A. The standard definition runs as follows:

1. Populists were devoted to serving the people.

2. They believed that only socialism would improve the lives of the common people.

3. They believed in Russia's special historical opportunity to avoid the evils of capitalism.

4. They believed that political changes were secondary to the transformation of social and economic relations.

B. These ideas had a remarkable power for many educated Russians.

C. An example of the ideas that brought many young Russians to feelings of intellectual and sentimental rapture can be found in Petr Lavrov's *Historical Letters*.

1. Lavrov was dissatisfied with Hegel, the most popular philosopher of the day, because Hegel did not provide an ideal of morality that might guide practical action.

2. For Lavrov, the principle of *lichnost'* (the person, the self) was at the center of his practical philosophy—social relations and politics should promote individual welfare.

3. He also argued that it was the duty of "critically thinking individuals" to act on behalf of society as a whole.

4. Lavrov rejected the materialism and utilitarianism that had been dominant in the 1860s and, like Kant, insisted on the existence of natural moral truths: natural human personal dignity and the necessity of justice.

D. V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky's *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia* (1869) impressed people with its brutally frank picture of the sufferings of peasants and urban workers.

E. Nikolai Mikhailovskii's essay "What Is Progress?" (1870) showed that real progress advances human self-realization, in contrast to harmful capitalist "progress."

F. This message was reinforced in 1872 by the publication in Russia of the first volume of Karl Marx's *Capital*, translated by two populists.

G. None of these works placed any real emphasis on the idea that is usually seen as defining populism: a socialist society based on the peasant commune.

1. Censorship was partly to blame.

2. Populism's more essential concern, though, was a moral obsession with creating a moral society.

3. Indeed, populism could be defined first and foremost as a moral philosophy, out of which emerged its notions of socialism.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

III. More than earlier dissenting movements, populism demanded practical action in society by critically thinking individuals.

- **A.** Populists organized libraries, gave lectures, and ran discussion circles for workers and peasants.
- **B.** In 1874, thousands of young people left the cities to "go to the people."
- **C.** The message they carried was simple.
  - **1.** All the land should belong to the people, the economy should be organized collectively, and everyone should be free and equal.
  - **2.** Sometimes, they simply argued their views directly, openly challenging church, landlord, and tsar.
  - **3.** Many took a more indirect approach by translating their ideas into religious terms or telling stories in the style of peasant folktales but reflecting their new morality.
- **D.** Peasants had a mixed response.
  - **1.** Some individual peasants responded positively.
  - **2.** Usually, though, peasants were polite but unmoved.
  - **3.** Some peasants reacted with open hostility and handed students over to the police or even beat them up.
- **E.** Overall, the movement was a failure, especially in relation to expectations.
  - **1.** Peasants refused to believe criticisms against the tsar.
  - **2.** Student radicals also had trouble overcoming peasant fatalism and submissiveness.

IV. Populists were initially divided over what to do in the wake of the "mad summer" of 1874, though gradually two answers emerged.

- **A.** One answer was to deepen educational efforts ("propaganda"). After 1879, this effort was associated with a group called Black Repartition (*Chernyi peredel*).
- **B.** Another answer was terror, which was associated after 1879 with the very popular People's Will (*Narodnaia volia*).
- **C.** Historians have tried to explain the appeal of terrorism to many Russians at this time.
  - **1.** Given that the results of terrorism were obvious, it was a more satisfactory alternative to the fruitless efforts of previous years.
  - **2.** It reflected the growing belief that the peasants were ready to rebel.
  - **3.** It was a tactically effective way of showing people that the state (even the tsar himself) was not invulnerable.
  - **4.** It echoed government violence, especially, draconian punishments for relatively minor offenses.
- **D.** In their own statements, terrorists provided all these reasons, as well as suggesting other more deeply grounded motives.
  - **1.** Vera Zasulich—who shot the Governor-General of St. Petersburg—claimed that she acted to avenge the beating of a political prisoner she knew.
  - **2.** Sergei Kravchinskii, who stabbed to death the St. Petersburg chief of *gendarmes*, argued that he had to do this because the chief had trampled on the human dignity of others and thought himself above the law.
  - **3.** One might ask whether it is too farfetched to suggest that terror was paradoxically an ethical act?

V. By the late 1880s and early 1890s, as many populists began to be troubled by the ineffectiveness of their efforts, increasing numbers began to declare themselves to be Marxists.

- **A.** This shift began among the exiled leaders of the populist movement.
- **B.** In addition, an increasing number of populist study circles began to declare that they were Marxist.
- **C.** In 1895, in St. Petersburg, two circles led by Vladimir Lenin and Iulii Martov combined to form "The Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class."
  - **1.** They also decided that the educational work of the past was inadequate and terrorism was counterproductive.
  - **2.** Their new tactic was known as "agitation."
  - **3.** This led to growing attention among workers, but also police attention and arrests.
- **D.** In 1898, a congress in Minsk established the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

E. In 1900, the socialist newspaper *Iskra* (*The Spark*) was printed in Europe with networks of party cells in Russia.

VI. Why did Marxism have such an appeal among Russian *intelligenty*?

A. A key problem was how to reconcile faith with reality.

1. Populism had taught that Russia could avoid the evils of capitalism, but by the early 1890s, signs of the growth of capitalism were everywhere.

2. Populism also taught that peasants were naturally revolutionary, but the passivity of the peasantry seemed unchanged.

B. In addition, the government had effectively destroyed the populist movement by imprisoning or exiling most active revolutionaries.

C. In these depressing times, Marxism gave idealistic revolutionaries new reasons to hope.

1. It turned the necessity of recognizing capitalism into a virtue: Capitalism was a necessary stage leading to socialism.

2. Marxism offered new hope for revolution by helping radicals see an alternative revolutionary class: workers

3. There was a certain deterministic logic to Marxism, and many Marxists found this comforting.

4. Others, however, considered this historical determinism too constraining and passive.

Essential Reading:

Franco Venturi, *The Roots of Revolution* (London, 2001).

Supplementary Reading:

Barbara Alpern Engel and Clifford Rosenthal, *Five Sisters: Women against the Tsar* (Boston, 1987).

Leopold Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism* (Boston, 1955), chapters 1–3.

Peter Lavrov, *Historical Letters* (Berkeley, 1967).

Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford, 1979), chapters 12, 13, 18.

Questions to Consider:

1. How do Russian populist and later Marxist values and goals differ (or not) from liberal democratic ideals as we know them in the modern West?

2. Why was terrorism known as "propaganda of the deed"? What is the logic behind attempts to justify political violence and murder?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Sixteen

Paths to Revolution—Lenin and Martov

Scope: This lecture looks closely at the two most influential Marxists: the leader of the Bolsheviks, Vladimir Lenin, and his rival, the leader of the Mensheviks, Iulii Martov. The lecture begins with the split in the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party in 1903 over the question of membership, then explores the significance of these differences. The biographies and personalities of each man are considered—Martov's democratic and moral faith and Lenin's political passion and intolerance of moralizing. The lecture then examines different views of two fundamental ideas. The first is democracy, which Martov and Lenin understood quite differently. The second idea is consciousness—how people were seen to develop political understanding. In Martov's view, we see, Lenin seemed to distrust people as a matter of principle. The implications of these differences are considered. The lecture concludes by looking at Lenin's more willing embrace of violence.

Outline

I. In 1903, the recently established Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party—which sought to unite all Russian Marxists—held its second congress (in Western Europe, because the party was illegal).

- **A.** The various groups represented at the congress argued vehemently over many important issues, but the question that most divided them and that led to a permanent split in the party concerned the seemingly trivial question of membership.
  - **1.** Vladimir Ulianov—whose party nickname was Lenin—wished to limit party membership to active and regular participants in party organizations.
  - **2.** Iulii Tsederbaum—who used the name Martov—preferred a more inclusive definition of party member.
- **B.** Essential principles were at stake.
  - **1.** Lenin wanted a party that only included full-time revolutionaries—a vanguard—following strict party discipline.
  - **2.** Martov favored an open, mass party.
  - **3.** Lenin lost the vote on this question but held a slight majority when electing the party leaders.

II. Especially in his passion for justice, Martov was part of a tradition reaching well back in the history of the intelligentsia.

- **A.** Martov grew up as a Jew in Odessa in the 1870s and 1880s.
  - **1.** These were difficult times to be Jewish in Russia.
  - **2.** These years saw intense discrimination, as well as periodic anti-Jewish violence.
- **B.** Martov's parents were relatively educated and liberal.
- **C.** In high school, Martov became obsessed with social, political, and moral questions.
  - **1.** The conservative curriculum provided few answers.
  - **2.** He sought truth elsewhere.
- **D.** In the 1880s, his family moved to St. Petersburg, where he became involved in the student movement.
- **E.** In time, he turned to Marxism.
  - **1.** This meant faith in the proletarian and in the natural course of history.
  - **2.** No less important, Martov was inspired by a vision of an end to inequality, injustice, and suffering.

III. Lenin (Ulianov) was a quite different individual.

- **A.** In his early youth, Lenin was generally uninterested in political or social questions.
  - **1.** His father was a loyal provincial bureaucrat with vaguely liberal ideals.
  - **2.** The event that awakened Lenin to politics was the arrest, conviction, and public hanging of his older brother, Alexander, on charges of plotting the tsar's execution as a member of the People's Will.
  - **3.** Young Vladimir Ulianov was shocked and angered and began seeking to understand what motivated his brother.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

4. In time, he decided that he, too, would become a revolutionary.

B. People who knew Lenin were impressed by his intense passions.
1. He loved hunting and could spend a whole day racing through the woods in search of game.
2. He was obsessed with chess, which he could play from morning to night.
3. He was notoriously passionate about skating and mushroom collecting.
4. But most of all, he "raged" about politics.

C. An early example of Lenin's intense style is his polemic against the populists.
1. In part, he offered the standard Marxist critique of the populist faith that capitalism could be avoided in Russia.
2. But Lenin also made it clear that he despised the political moralizing so common to populist socialism.

IV. Consider Lenin's and Martov's different notions of democracy—a term that dissenting Russians, from liberals to socialists, claimed to support.

A. Martov was attracted to Marxism precisely for its democratic promise.
1. He believed in the value of political representation and civil freedoms as natural rights rooted in recognition of human dignity.
2. Martov also believed that this political democracy would need to be supplemented by social democracy.

B. Lenin shared this embrace of social democracy, but he had a quite different view of political democracy.
1. He did not value political freedom and rights for their own sake.
2. For Lenin, political democracy had mainly an instrumental value.
3. He considered political democracy to be valuable as a situational and utilitarian value not as a universal and moral value.
4. One expression of this was his almost visceral hatred of liberals and liberalism.

V. Related to these ideas about democracy is the more complex question of "consciousness"—how ordinary people came to recognize that their interests lay in struggle against autocracy and capitalism.

A. Martov believed strongly in what might be called the consciousness-raising benefits of experience itself.
1. Everything about workers' lives would lead them toward class consciousness and belief in socialism.
2. Workers needed organizational help and political education, but Martov had confidence in workers' natural political evolution.
3. We see this view in practice during moments of upheaval, such as the 1905 revolution, when Mensheviks actively supported workers' strikes and unions.

B. Lenin was less sanguine about workers' experience.
1. Lenin was deeply suspicious of the results of workers' learning from experience alone ("spontaneity").
2. As he argued in his "What Is to Be Done" (1902), workers, left to themselves, will never be able to see beyond the economic struggle and to understand that their interests lie in overthrowing the existing social system.

C. The implications of Lenin's views were considerable.
1. This logic led Lenin to insist that workers (as a class) not be allowed to lead their own movement.
2. The vanguard party, whose members were full-time revolutionaries, would provide the leadership role.
3. The idea that the party was the embodiment of the consciousness that the masses lacked was expressed symbolically in the title the Bolsheviks chose for their newspaper in 1912: *Pravda* (*Truth*). By contrast, the Mensheviks named their paper *Rabochaia gazeta* (*Workers' Paper*).

D. Martov had a simple and blunt view of Lenin's ideas about consciousness and spontaneity: Lenin "did not trust people."

E. Another explanation focuses on the influence of the populists, who believed in the creative power of individuals to change history

F. The heritage of the terrorist People's Will was also evident in another typical aspect of Leninism.
1. Lenin and the Bolsheviks liked to portray themselves as tough-minded and "hard."
2. In turn, Lenin liked to portray the Mensheviks as "soft" and lacking in revolutionary spirit.
3. After 1917, this willingness to use "plebian measures" would lead to some rather brutal policies.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Essential Reading:

Robert Service, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge, 2000).

Supplementary Reading:

Israel Getzler, *Martov: A Political Biography of a Russian Social Democrat* (Cambridge, England, 1967).

Leopold Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism* (Boston, 1955).

Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Lenin Anthology* (New York, 1975), part 1.

Questions to Consider:

1. How did Lenin and Martov differently value liberal democratic goals, such as free speech, freedom of assembly and organization, and democratic elections?
2. Why did Lenin so distrust "spontaneity"?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Seventeen
Lev Tolstoy

Scope: This lecture looks at one of the most remarkable men in modern Russian life, notable both as a famous writer and as a public voice of morality and conscience. It considers the stages of his life: privileged and dissipated aristocrat, celebrated novelist, and religious and moral prophet. To understand the connections among these stages, the lecture explores Tolstoy's search for the meaning of life and for a morality that could guide both personal life and that of his country and the world. Tolstoy's preoccupation, in his life and his writings, with self-perfection and the search for truth is examined. Next, the lecture looks at his pursuit of simplicity and a natural life and considers his critique of individualism. Finally, the lecture examines his religious views, which resulted in his excommunication. The lecture concludes by looking at Tolstoy's continual uncertainties and his final abandonment of home and family and tragic death on the road.

Outline

I. Both idolized as a saint and reviled as a false prophet, Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy (1828–1910) was a great literary figure, as well as a major voice in Russia's public life.

- **A.** Russians have traditionally believed that writers should do more than entertain; they should also speak the truth and serve as witnesses to good and evil in the world.
- **B.** But even in this tradition, Tolstoy was unique, as no other Russian writer generated a civic movement that took his name.
- **C.** In many respects, Tolstoy's life seemed to echo some of the hagiographic traditions in Russia of a saint's life.

II. Superficially, Tolstoy's life seems to have had three major periods.

- **A.** The first is a youth filled with privilege and typical aristocratic dissipation.
  - **1.** Tolstoy was born in 1828 into a wealthy family of hereditary landed aristocrats.
  - **2.** His early life was fairly typical of his class: He was educated at the family estate of Iasnaia poliana, then attended Kazan University for three years before dropping out and returning to his estates in 1847.
  - **3.** During the next few years, he led a rather dissipated life in Moscow and Petersburg.
  - **4.** In 1851, Tolstoy joined the army as an officer and fought in the Crimean War, though he also began to write fiction.
  - **5.** In 1856, he quit the army to devote himself to writing.
- **B.** The second period of Tolstoy's life was that of the great novelist, the author of *War and Peace*, *Anna Karenina*, and other famous works.
- **C.** The third period of his life seems quite different from the first two.
  - **1.** Around 1878, Tolstoy experienced a religious crisis that resulted in his "conversion" to a truer Christianity.
  - **2.** In his own everyday life, he tried to exemplify the ideals of simplicity and nonviolence.
  - **3.** During the final years of his life, he considered becoming a hermit or a pilgrim.
  - **4.** In 1910, he fled his estate, his family, and the world, dying while on the road.

III. This simple story focuses on the external aspects of Tolstoy's life and exaggerates the breaks in his life. The deeper story is more complicated.

- **A.** Tolstoy was obsessed with self-perfection and the search for truth during most of his life.
  - **1.** We see this, for example, already in the 1840s, in the preoccupation with self-perfection in his diary.
  - **2.** His diaries are also filled with rules.
- **B.** Tolstoy's search for self-understanding and moral perfection pervaded his literary works, as well.
  - **1.** In his first major literary publication, the trilogy *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth*, Tolstoy psychologically analyzed his own developing consciousness.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. In the major work of his middle period, *War and Peace* (first draft completed in 1869), the themes of self-examination and self-perfection are even more evident.
3. Several characters in *War and Peace* undertake journeys of self-discovery, notably the most autobiographical figure, Pierre Bezukhov.
4. At the end of his psychological and moral journey, Bezukhov meets the peasant Platon Karataev, who exemplifies many of the principles of life that Tolstoy would embrace in the 1880s.
5. Nevertheless, Bezukhov remains uncertain about whether he has found the truth.

IV. From very early on, Tolstoy idealized simplicity.

A. He strongly believed that human beings were born innocent but were ruined by the institutions of civilization.
1. Western education, he argued, ruined people's natural innocence by blinding them to the deepest truths.
2. But these truths can be perceived by those whose innocence is still intact (children and peasants).

B. Tolstoy's educational efforts on his own estate were connected to these ideas.
1. He organized a school for peasant boys where basic skills were taught.
2. But he also sought to preserve children's natural intelligence and will to learn, as well as their naturally harmonious relations with nature and other people.

C. These ideas are visible in most of Tolstoy's work.

V. Another major theme in Tolstoy's writing is his advocacy of the need for self-renunciation, his anti-individualism.

A. Most of Tolstoy's great novels make a case against the autonomous individual.

B. In *War and Peace*, Tolstoy tries to demonstrate that even "great men," such as Napoleon, are powerless to affect the movement of history.

C. In *Anna Karenina*, Anna's two selves engage in an ultimately tragic struggle that leaves her with nothing but her individuality, which leads her to commit suicide.

VI. Tolstoy's many ideas led him to think in new ways about religion, for which the Russian Orthodox Church excommunicated him in 1901.

A. For Tolstoy, official Christianity was deeply flawed.
1. It masked, crushed, and perverted the real meanings of life.
2. In his view, the universal truths that were at the heart of Christianity were hidden behind ritual and mysticism.

B. Tolstoy argued that the real greatness of Jesus Christ was that he could see through the falsehoods of civilization.

C. The whole of true Christianity, for Tolstoy, was expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, which instructs people to refrain from actions that their nature tells them are wrong.

D. Inspired by this ethical reading of Christianity, Tolstoy rejected much that the established Orthodox Church held sacred.
1. He rejected most of the theology of the church.
2. He rejected the need for priests, sacraments, and liturgy.
3. He even began rewriting the Gospels to remove everything that was mystical and supernatural.

VII. Uncertainty, doubt, and contradiction remained in Tolstoy's thought

A. His arguments were often contradictory.
1. Although he famously argued for quietism (nonresistance to evil), he also insisted that evil must be criticized and fought.
2. He combined a belief in learning from the simple people with the conviction that they must be taught to see the truth.
3. He combined a belief in natural absolute truths with recognition that their verity could never be demonstrated.
4. He believed in faith but disdained blind unquestioning faith.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. Tolstoy never stopped asking questions and struggling to find certainty.
   1. In the end, the uncertainty that plagued him led to his final tragic journey.
   2. Yet the heart of his genius lay in his uncertainty and contradictions.

Essential Reading:

Henri Troyat, *Tolstoy* (New York, 1967).

Isaiah Berlin, "The Hedgehog and the Fox" and "Tolstoy and Enlightenment," in *Russian Thinkers* (New York, 1995).

Supplementary Reading:

Lev Tolstoy, *Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth*; *War and Peace*; *Anna Karenina*; *Resurrection*.

Questions to Consider:

1. What did Tolstoy mean when he argued that children and peasants were closest to understanding the greatest truths?

2. Can we see in Tolstoy's great novels the roots of his later religious and moral advocacy?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Eighteen
The Reign of Alexander III

Scope: This lecture examines policies and ideas during the reign of Alexander III. It begins with a look at Alexander III's "counter-reforms," especially his efforts to limit civic liberalization, but also at his efforts to stimulate economic progress. To understand the ideas motivating policy, the lecture examines Alexander's efforts to revive traditional forms and return to the past, evident in his personal style, the construction of old Russian-style churches, and the articulation of a political philosophy of personal autocracy. The lecture suggests that behind the image of political confidence and certainty lay anxieties about the dangers of the modern world. We then turn to a discussion of the outlook and ideas of Alexander's closest adviser, Konstantin Pobedonostsev. His personal and political influence is described, along with his conservative ideology: his critique of all constitutional or legal limitations on the monarch and his critique of the Great Reforms. The lecture next looks at Pobedonostsev's pessimistic views of existence and his philosophical distrust of human beings. His views of family, Church, and the autocratic state as the only hope for Russia are considered.

Outline

I. The reign of Alexander III (ruled 1881–1894) has often been described as an "era of reaction."

A. To be fair, Alexander III was not entirely opposed to all change and reform.

1. Like all Russian rulers, he recognized the need for national progress to maintain and develop the strength of the nation and the state.

2. The reforms during his reign were almost entirely economic, including a peasants' land bank, a gentry land bank, the abolition of the head tax, and efforts to stimulate industrial growth and modernization.

B. But these positive reforms were overshadowed by the so-called counter-reforms.

1. The most important of these were the "Temporary Regulations" of 1881, which created conditions of virtual martial law.

2. The censorship code was strengthened to prevent and punish dissent.

3. University autonomy was ended in 1884.

4. To increase bureaucratic control over the *zemstvos* and the peasant communes, state-appointed "land captains" were introduced in 1889.

5. During the early 1890s, the government increased central control over the *zemstvos.*

6. Bureaucratic control over the municipal governments was also increased.

7. An aggressive policy of Russification and discrimination against national minorities (especially Jews) was enforced.

II. Alexander III was engaged in a radical project: to save Russia from disorder by turning away from the path of continual Westernization laid down by so many of his predecessors.

A. We see this turn to the Russian past even in Alexander's visual appearance.

B. Another symbolically important way Alexander sought to recall Russia's ancient traditions was by constructing an intensely Muscovite-style church on the spot where his father, Alexander II, had been assassinated by a terrorist's bomb.

C. But Alexander's turn to the past was most explicitly visible in his political beliefs.

1. Alexander believed deeply in the benefits of strong power.

2. The "Temporary Regulations" of 1881 exemplified this; they allowed the tsar to freely appoint governors with "extraordinary" discretionary power and gave state authorities a virtually free hand to punish dissent.

3. Minister of Finance Sergei Witte described Alexander as a "mountain of stone," recalling the classic ideal of the *groznyi tsar*.

4. But Alexander also sought the stance of a traditional *tishaishii tsar*, as was visible in his religious faith, which he considered central to Russianness.

D. Although Alexander exuded calm, imperturbable confidence, there is reason to think that his desire to turn Russia toward the past and away from reform also reflected fear and foreboding about change.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

E. One sign of these anxieties was a remarkable turning away from public life in ruling circles.

III. His closest adviser, Konstantin Pobedonostsev (1827–1907), provides one indication of these doubts and anxieties.

A. During the final decades of tsarist rule, Pobedonostsev was one of the most powerful and influential intellectuals in Russia.

1. From 1880 to 1905, he was Chief Procurator (lay director) of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church.

2. He also directly influenced the thinking of Russia's last two tsars, serving as their tutor when they were young and as adviser when they were in power.

B. Pobedonostsev opposed any constitutional or legal limitations on the power of the monarch.

1. The tone with which he condemned constitutionalism is as revealing as the fact itself.

2. In 1881, when Alexander III first came to power, Pobedonostsev shocked many ministers by condemning even the modestly liberal reforms of Alexander II.

3. One minister declared Pobedonostsev's arguments to be "a negation of all that is at the foundation of European civilization."

4. Philosophically, Pobedonostsev did indeed reject the main philosophical value of the European Enlightenment: the belief in reason.

C. But more than philosophy lay behind Pobedonostsev's conservatism. A primary motive for Pobedonostsev was fear: fear of modernity, fear of people, fear about the future.

1. Pobedonostsev's outlook on life was pessimistic and misanthropic.

2. Like most nineteenth-century conservatives, Pobedonostsev had a dismal view of humanity.

3. Given these convictions about human nature, his view of the future encompassed only misery and error.

D. Pobedonostsev saw only three institutions that might save Russia in these conditions: the family, the Orthodox Church, and the state.

1. For Pobedonostsev, the family's job was to repress children's evil instincts by teaching obedience.

2. The Church was expected to teach obedience and to provide the spiritual and ideological cement to hold society together and ensure stability.

3. The autocratic state was of the greatest importance, because it embodied the truth that men, not laws, must rule.

4. This was not a confident ideology. Although it emerged from a faith in tradition, it also arose from emotional and philosophical fear about the future and loathing for human nature.

Essential Reading:

Hans Rogger, *Russia in the Age of Modernization and Revolution, 1881–1917* (London and New York, 1983), chapters 1–6.

Supplementary Reading:

Robert Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought* (Bloomington, 1968).

Konstantin Pobedonostsev, *Reflections of a Russian Statesman* (Ann Arbor, 1965).

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton, 2000), vol. 2, chapters 5–8.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are the underlying ideas and purposes motivating Alexander III's "counter-reforms"?

2. Why was Pobedonostsev so vehemently opposed to any legal limitations on the authority of the monarch?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Nineteen
Nicholas II, the Last Tsar

Scope: This lecture focuses on the personality, values, and ideas of Russia's last monarch. Notwithstanding arguments that Nicholas had no interest in governance or ideas about rulership, the lecture explores his essential political philosophy. First, the lecture explores Nicholas II's embrace of the tradition of autocratic authoritarianism, especially as reflected in his obsessions (personal and political) with order and discipline and in his love of military culture. Next, the lecture looks at Nicholas as *tishaishii tsar*: his public ritual enactments of the ideal of the tsar as united in love and harmony with his people and his deep religious belief that God acted through him. His relationship with Rasputin is viewed in the light of these beliefs and ideals. The lecture concludes with Nicholas II's fatalism and the relationship of his values and ideals to his eventual fall.

Outline

I. To speak honestly and fairly about Nicholas II (ruled 1896–1917) is a difficult task.
- **A.** Nicholas II has often been described as a weak ruler, who focused more on family than politics.
- **B.** He has also been depicted as a narrow-minded tyrant who ruthlessly held onto power in an age of social change and rising democracy.
- **C.** Due to his brutal execution, along with his family, in the middle of the night in 1918, he has been portrayed him as a tragic figure, a martyr, even a saint.
- **D.** To avoid these simplifications and clichés, we need to try to understand Nicholas on his own terms, to explore his own ways of thinking about life and politics.
- **E.** Nicholas drew upon two large political-cultural traditions in formulating his ideas about rule.
  - **1.** The first of these sees the ruler as "awesome" in power and might—the tradition of the *groznyi tsar*.
  - **2.** The second mythic ideal sees the ruler as a sacred and divine figure, loving and conciliatory, who seeks unity with his people—the tradition of the *tishaishii tsar*.

II. Like his father, Nicholas II was strongly attracted to the *groznyi* traditions of order and might.
- **A.** He was obsessed with order, regularity, and discipline.
  - **1.** His diary provides a documentary account of this ideal.
  - **2.** Nicholas tried to imbue his life with order: self-discipline, neatness, systematization. Anna Vyrubova, lady-in-waiting to his wife, described Nicholas as "the tidiest, most systematic of men."
  - **3.** His deep attraction to military culture arose from this love of order.
  - **4.** Rituals of tradition, order, discipline, and military might provided Nicholas with a sense of "calm" and "pleasure" that he found deeply meaningful personally.
- **B.** These are matters of personality and personal values, but they also shaped Nicholas's ideas about society and politics.
  - **1.** In his view, all people should be guided by the virtues of self-discipline, orderliness, and regularity.
  - **2.** He believed strongly that the autocratic order was the key to Russia's might and stability and its progress and virtue as a nation.
  - **3.** His persistent rejection of appeals for political freedom and democracy reflected these views.

III. But Nicholas also embraced the Russian tradition of the *tishaishii* tsar*,* of the *tsar-batiushka* (tsar-father).
- **A.** Nicholas II devoted much effort to expressing this ideal in publicly visible ways, and found in these public rituals confirmation of his faith.
  - **1.** In 1900, Nicholas started a new tradition of regularly celebrating Easter with his family in Moscow's ancient Kremlin churches and cathedrals.
  - **2.** He often observed and admired peasants' devotion to him as he traveled the country.
  - **3.** During Nicholas's tour of the heartland to celebrate the tercentenary of the Romanov dynasty in 1913, he was deeply moved by what he viewed as signs of popular love of the autocracy.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

4. The demonstrations on Palace Square at the beginning of World War I similarly impressed him with the people's devotion.
5. Reflecting this faith in the union of ruler and people, Alexandra and her elder daughters served as nurses during the war.
6. Certain that his charismatic presence would inspire his people to victory, Nicholas assumed personal command of the army in 1915.

B. Nicholas believed deeply in the divine source of his authority.
1. He was certain that God literally spoke and acted through him.
2. Nicholas found ever-increasing comfort in religious practice and faith.
3. Nicholas and Alexandra's famous attraction to Grigorii Rasputin was connected to this faith.

IV. Many of these stories about Nicholas as man and ruler may seem admirable and even charming, but they also form an essential part of the story of Nicholas's fall from power.

A. Many factors contributed to the overthrow of the tsarist order in 1917.
1. The devastating war with Germany and Austria was a major cause.
2. No less important were the growing desires in society for democratic change and social reform.
3. Meanwhile, the autocracy was retreating into an intractable faith in Russia's ancient (and archaic) political ideal of a mystical bond between absolute tsar and loving people.

B. Nicholas's deep fatalism also contributed to his downfall.
1. For Nicholas, everything was ultimately God's will.
2. This belief formed a leitmotif throughout his life: when he assumed the throne, when people were trampled to death during celebrations of his coronation in Moscow in 1896, during the revolutionary upheavals of 1905, and in 1917, when he was forced from power and Romanov rule ended.

Essential Reading:

Dominic Lieven, *Nicholas II* (New York, 1994).

Supplementary Reading:

Mark D. Steinberg and Vladimir Khrustalev, *The Fall of the Romanovs: Political Dreams and Personal Struggles in a Time of Revolution* (New Haven, 1995).

Andrew Verner, *The Crisis of Russian Autocracy: Nicholas II and the 1905 Revolution* (Princeton, 1990).

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton, 2000), vol. 2, chapters 9–15.

Questions to Consider:

1. In the face of the steady modernization of Russian life, why did Nicholas II hold so firmly to the old traditions of autocratic authoritarianism and patriarchalism?
2. Do you agree with the suggestion that one of the reasons the monarchy fell was Nicholas II's insistence on preserving traditional forms of authority? Could his vision of authority have been compatible with a modern society?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty
The Revolution of 1905

Scope: This lecture describes a key event in modern Russian history: the strikes, demonstrations, and public demands that the tsarist government accept civil rights and democratic rule in Russia. The lecture begins by exploring the growing liberal movement and its programs. Next, the growth of a socialist movement is described, as are the discontents of workers and peasants. The Russo-Japanese war and the government's "political spring" of 1904 are viewed as stimulants to protest. The key events of the year are examined: Bloody Sunday, the upsurge in strikes and demands, the October general strike, the October manifesto, and the continuing but weakening protests that followed. The lecture concludes by considering the shape and meaning of the government's reforms as these were elaborated in the following years.

Outline

I. In 1905, the autocracy confronted its greatest political challenge to date: a massive social and political revolution that was the most dramatic sign yet of the steady growth of opposition to traditional autocracy.

- **A.** Particularly important was the rise of liberalism since the turn of the century.
  - **1.** Liberal ideas in Russia can be traced back to the late eighteenth century.
  - **2.** Most liberals agreed on a common program: civil rights, rule of law, "four-tail" suffrage (universal, equal, direct, secret), parliamentary government, local self-government, and social reforms.
- **B.** Socialists were also becoming more organized.
  - **1.** The Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party was growing.
  - **2.** The populist Socialist Revolutionary (SR) party arose in 1901.
  - **3.** Like the populists before them, the SRs had two faces: propaganda, which focused on education and organization, and terrorism.
- **C.** Discontent was increasing among peasants, who were unhappy with the settlement of the land issue and with their poverty.
- **D.** Dissatisfaction among the growing class of urban workers was on the rise.
  - **1.** Workers' material situation in the city was often horrible.
  - **2.** But more was at stake than material change: As workers were exposed to new ideas and to the inequalities of city life, ideas about a more just society began to develop.
  - **3.** Since the 1890s, the strike movement had been growing, and workers were increasingly responsive to appeals by radicals.

II. Into this increasingly dangerous situation entered two potentially explosive elements: war and reform.

- **A.** In early 1904, Japan, not without provocation, launched a war with Russia over control of Korea and Manchuria, during which Russia suffered a series of humiliating defeats.
- **B.** The government made another attempt at reform.
  - **1.** In August 1904, Socialist Revolutionaries assassinated one of the most reactionary men in the government: the Minister of Internal Affairs, Viacheslav von Plehve.
  - **2.** He was replaced by the relatively liberal Prince Dmitrii Sviatopolk-Mirskii, who initiated what came to be called a "political spring."
- **C.** His initial steps, and promises of greater reform, encouraged more protest, first of all among liberals.
  - **1.** At meetings in various organizations, resolutions were passed calling for political reform.
  - **2.** The Union of Liberation staged a massive "banquet campaign."
  - **3.** Liberal demands were much the same as they had been in the past: civil liberties, equality of citizens before the law, more local self-government, and an elected national assembly.
- **D.** This liberal campaign might have died out or been easily crushed by the government had it not been for the movement of workers and students in the streets, provoked by the shooting of workers bringing a petition to the Winter Palace on January 9, 1905 ("Bloody Sunday").
  - **1.** In 1901, hoping to lead workers away from the radicals, the government established special legal labor organizations under the control of the secret police (the Okhrana).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. A priest and police-agent named Georgii Gapon established one of these organizations in St. Petersburg in 1904.
3. In December 1904, Gapon's organization decided to organize a massive march to convey workers' grievances to the tsar himself.
4. On January 9, 1905, Father Gapon led tens of thousands of workers carrying pictures of the tsar, icons, and church banners in a march to the Winter Palace with a petition for Nicholas II.
5. The crowd was met by troops with orders to fire on the crowds approaching the palace.

III. Bloody Sunday marked the beginning of the revolution.

A. In the following weeks, everything the government had long feared came to pass: a mass strike movement, the rise of unions and *soviets*, endless demonstrations, growing political opposition.

B. To calm the massive unrest that followed Bloody Sunday, the government granted mild concessions.
1. In February, Nicholas II promised to establish a consultative assembly—a Duma.
2. But unrest continued because most people wanted real legislative power and guaranteed civil rights.

C. In early October, a massive general strike occurred. The political demands were the same everywhere: complete civil liberties and a constituent assembly to establish a new constitutional order.

D. Although Nicholas later regretted his weakness, he made a further concession and signed the October Manifesto on October 17.
1. For the first time in Russian history, all Russians were guaranteed civil liberties and a Duma with legislative powers was promised.
2. Russia was to become a constitutional monarchy.

E. Yet many in society still desired more (or did not trust the government's promises).
1. Many workers and socialists condemned the Manifesto as inadequate and continued to protest.
2. Students continued to refuse to attend classes.
3. Soldiers and sailors occasionally rebelled.
4. In the border areas of the empire, national groups began to demand independence.
5. Peasants began to seize land.

F. Many liberals found this popular movement frightening, splitting the united social front for democracy that had existed until then.
1. Some liberals shared the view that the Manifesto granted too little and too late.
2. More moderate liberals felt that the Manifesto had gone far enough and feared that further opposition would encourage dangerous social unrest.

IV. Details of the promised political reforms were announced during 1906.

A. These reforms represented a major attempt to include people in the formulation of policy.
1. Political parties were legalized.
2. Russian men from all classes were to be allowed to participate in elections to the Duma.
3. The Duma itself was given legislative authority.

B. But the new Duma proved to be a frustrating reminder of the autocracy's unwillingness to accept real political reform.
1. Voting laws were skewed in favor of classes the government considered most trustworthy: landowners and peasants.
2. The Duma's legislative power was severely restricted.
3. The Duma's competence was limited.

C. The Duma continued to offer people a public voice and even some real power, but also to whet people's appetites for true representation.

D. Partial social reforms left workers and peasants dissatisfied.

Essential Reading:

Abraham Ascher, *The Russian Revolution of 1905* (Stanford, 1988 and 1992), 2 volumes.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Gerald Surh, *1905 in St. Petersburg* (Stanford, 1989).

Laura Engelstein, *Moscow, 1905* (Stanford, 1982).

Questions to Consider:

1. Compare Nicholas II's vision of the political relationship that ought to exist between government and people and the models articulated by liberals, students, worker protesters, and others during the 1905 revolution.
2. Did the Russian state become a constitutional monarchy after October 1905?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-One
Peasant Life and Culture

Scope: This lecture discusses the experiences, values, and ambitions of Russian peasants—the vast majority of the population—in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The lecture begins by considering common images of the Russian common people—as idealized embodiments of the moral and spiritual genius of the Russian nation or as backward savages. To understand the actual lives and cultural world of Russian peasants, the lecture focuses on several key themes. First, it looks at traditions of community in peasant life, especially as concerned with agriculture and law and order. Next, the lecture explores peasant religious traditions as means of understanding and coping with the world: the veneration of icons but also older traditions and the syncretism of Christian and pre-Christian forms. Peasant "land hunger" is next considered. Finally, the lecture explores signs of cultural change in the village: the growth of literacy and reading and the impact of migration to the cities.

Outline

I. Educated Russians were preoccupied with the Russian common folk, the *narod*.

- **A.** In Russia, from the late eighteenth century until at least the 1940s, to talk about the *narod* was to talk about Russia as a nation (part of the meaning of the word).
- **B.** Two large general images of the *narod* predominated.
  - **1.** In one image, the peasants embodied all the qualities that gave Russia its particular moral and spiritual greatness: egalitarianism, closeness to nature, folk wisdom, spirituality, personal dignity.
  - **2.** In the other image, the peasant is a dark savage, backward and ignorant.
- **C.** These images are parts of peasant reality, but a complete picture requires that we consider peasants from their own point of view, that we explore their values and ways of seeing the world.

II. In certain areas of peasant life, traditional forms and values seemed especially strong.

- **A.** The idea of community was central to the way peasants looked at the world.
  - **1.** In all traditional villages, many important decisions continued to be made by an assembly composed of the heads of households within the "commune."
  - **2.** The village commune enforced community moral norms and social order.
  - **3.** Individuals were less important than the community and its norms, and infractions of these norms were punished by public humiliation.
  - **4.** Peasants understood that this sense of community would help them survive in a harsh world.
- **B.** Religion was another important aspect of the peasants' worldview.
  - **1.** Religion helped peasants understand and cope with a harsh world.
  - **2.** Although Russian peasants were Christians (mostly Eastern Orthodox but also Old Believers and members of schismatic "sects"), their Orthodoxy had its own forms, emphases, and adaptations.
  - **3.** Peasants saw the world as a place filled with powerful spirits and forces for both good and evil, but they also believed that they could understand and influence their world.
  - **4.** Icons were central to the life of Orthodox peasants as means of appealing to saints, Christ, and Mary for help.
  - **5.** Magic rites and incantations, holy water, and prayer supplemented the power of icons to heal and cure.
  - **6.** Peasants also turned to priests and monks, as well as wandering holy men, sorcerers, and magic healers.
  - **7.** Thus, for Russian peasants, religion was a rich combination of Christianity and older mystical and magical traditions.

III. Discontent was also prevalent among the post-emancipation peasantry.

- **A.** Peasants were increasingly preoccupied with the need for more land.
- **B.** This "land hunger" arose from a number of factors.
  - **1.** The emancipation gave peasants only part of the land they had formerly worked.
  - **2.** Enormous growth in population had reduced the amount of land each family possessed.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. Peasants also felt the need for more land because of the low productivity of the land they worked, which was caused by poor soil and a short growing season, the backwardness of the peasant economy, and the inefficiencies of communal agriculture.
4. Peasants believed that by right, the land should belong to those who work it.

C. Had economic conditions for the peasants improved, it is possible that the dream of getting all the land might have faded—but poverty kept these dreams alive.

IV. Peasants were not living in an unchanging world apart—on the contrary, their lives were entwined with the larger world and changed dramatically during the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century.

A. Schools proliferated.

B. Literacy rose.

C. The number of publications directed at common people increased significantly.
1. Numerous cheap newspapers and illustrated magazines reached common readers.
2. Many books, from science to adventure stories, also appeared.

D. Many peasants (especially young men) left the countryside to go to work in the growing industrial cities.
1. Their lives in the cities encouraged new tastes that they often carried back to the village.
2. They also began to acquire (or at least to covet) material possessions.

E. The peasants' mental world was complex, contradictory, and in flux.
1. The value they placed on community competed with the idea of individual assertiveness.
2. Strong moral values existed alongside brutality.
3. Awe before a world filled with magical power vied with the peasants' sense of their own power to cope or, perhaps, even to prosper.
4. An acceptance of suffering coexisted with dreams of change.

Essential Reading:

Olga Semyonova Tian-Shanskaia, *Village Life in Late Tsarist Russia* (Bloomington, 1993).

Supplementary Reading:

Jeffrey Burds, *Peasant Dreams and Market Politics: Labor Migration and the Russian Village, 1861–1905* (Pittsburgh, 1998).

Barbara Alpern Engel, *Between the Fields and the City: Women, Work, and Family in Russia, 1861–1914* (Cambridge, England, 1995).

Stephen Frank, *Crime, Cultural Conflict, and Justice in Rural Russia, 1856–1914* (Berkeley, 1999).

Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1994), introduction, chapters 1–5.

Christine Worobec, *Peasant Russia* (DeKalb, 1995).

Questions to Consider:

1. How can one explain the combination in peasant religion of Christian and pre-Christian traditions? Is this merely, as some have argued, the veneer of Christianity over essential paganism? Can we understand this combination more deeply from peasants' own point of view?
2. How would you describe the peasant ideal of a good life?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Two
The Modern City and Its Discontents

Scope: This lecture shifts attention to urban life and change from the 1890s to the eve of World War I. It begins by exploring the evidence of a flourishing public sphere: periodical press and book publication, voluntary associations, and sites of public entertainment. Paralleling this positive face of urban modernity was a darker side. Using stories in the popular press, we look at evidence of personal danger in the modern city, uncertain identities, hooliganism, murder, and suicide, and how these were interpreted. Next, the lecture examines modern urban life from the perspective of an urban worker. In particular, we focus on workers' words: collective demands, memoirs and published essays, even poetry. At the center of much of this writing, we see, is concern with the individual personality and its fate in the modern city.

Outline

I. The idea of a public sphere is useful for understanding the development of urban life at the turn of the century and after.

- **A.** A public sphere is a social space between private life and the life of the state.
  - **1.** It is generally organized around various institutions.
  - **2.** People can participate in public life freely without repression or coercion.
  - **3.** It is a space where public opinions take shape and are expressed.
  - **4.** Many would argue that the public sphere is the essential foundation for a democratic society.
- **B.** Such a public sphere was flourishing in Russian cities in the late 1880s and especially after 1905.
  - **1.** The steady growth of the press in Russia contributed to this trend.
  - **2.** Voluntary civic organizations formed, including charities, service organizations, and business and professional societies.
  - **3.** There were also various forms of public entertainment where a diverse public could gather.
- **C.** Of course, none of this existed without some measure of resistance by the state.

II. Modernity and a thriving public life created a city filled with opportunity, excitement, and possibility, but this was also a landscape filled with danger and difficulties.

- **A.** Newspapers in such cities as Petersburg or Moscow provided much evidence that Russian life was moving in a healthy direction.
  - **1.** Stories about the spread of scientific knowledge and technical know-how appeared.
  - **2.** Tales of entrepreneurial success and of individual upward mobility were also published.
  - **3.** Other writers reported on the increasing role of cultural institutions and civic organizations in urban life.
  - **4.** Articles on the civilizing effects of living amidst beautiful architecture and the orderliness of city streets and buildings were common.
- **B.** More troubling stories about city life are also found.
  - **1.** Danger—of accidental death, disease, and crime—was ever-present in the modern Russian city.
  - **2.** Most disturbing were the stories that revealed that people were not what they seemed, that it was difficult to know whom to trust.
  - **3.** A major urban problem was what the press called "hooliganism."
  - **4.** Death was a central theme in these stories of modern urban life.
  - **5.** Murders were reported with frightening regularity in the press and often attributed to the harmful nature of the modern city.
  - **6.** But the number of suicides—many of them deliberately enacted in public spaces—seemed most to reveal the dark heart of the urban landscape.
- **C.** For urban dwellers, city life could seem full of promising new possibilities, but it also was a place of anxiety, fear, and potential despair.

III. The newest type of city dweller, the industrial worker, offers an important perspective on urban life.

- **A.** One aspect of working-class life was the physical hardships and poverty workers experienced in the city.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. But the city was also the site for workers of new pleasures and possibilities.

C. No less part of the story of working-class life was what socialists called workers' awakening: their growing self-esteem, rising expectations, and exposure to new ideas.

IV. To better understand these historical trends, we need to listen to workers' own words, to working-class Russians' own efforts to explain what they experienced and what they desired.

A. Workers' collective demands (often presented during strikes) are one important body of evidence of their experiences and aspirations.

1. Some demands were the usual economic or political demands (higher wages, shorter hours, and civil rights).

2. But many demands focused on what might be called "moral issues," especially for "polite address."

B. Other major sources of workers' voices are their diaries, personal letters, and essays in the trade union or political party press.

1. Here, too, similar moral issues stand out, especially the idea that workers have the "right to live as human beings."

2. Sometimes, workers used such words as "exploitation," but more often, they used more emotional and ethical terms, including "despotism," "rudeness," and "cruelty."

3. Finally, workers most often justified their protest as a defense of *lichnost'*, of their dignity and, hence, their natural rights as human beings.

C. Some of the most remarkable expressions of concern with the self can be found in poetry written by workers.

1. The suffering self is one of the major themes of this body of writings.

2. For many workers, the solution was clear: the need for a society and a political system that respected the natural human dignity in each individual.

D. This ideal of *lichnost'* (of the person, the self) again can be seen as central to Russian life and how it was understood.

1. On the one hand, modern urban life seemed to provide an environment in which *lichnost'* could thrive, with new opportunities at every turn.

2. On the other hand, indignities and humiliations were no less pervasive than before.

Essential Reading:

Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1994), introduction, chapters 6–10.

Supplementary Reading:

Edith Clowes et al., eds., *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1991).

Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd, eds., *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution, 1881–1940* (Oxford, 1998).

Mark Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Ithaca, 2002).

Reginald Zelnik, ed., *A Radical Worker in Tsarist Russia: The Autobiography of Semen Ivanovich Kanatchikov* (Stanford, 1986).

Questions to Consider:

1. Were industrialization and urbanization leading to greater or lesser tensions in Russian society? Was a crisis looming?

2. Why, judging by stories in the popular press, were there such anxieties about modern urban life? What were the underlying concerns and values?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Three
Fin-de-Siècle Culture—Decadence and Iconoclasm

Scope: This lecture begins with the debate among historians over whether Russia was heading toward crisis and even revolution on the eve of the war. To further explore this question, the lecture examines two major cultural trends of the years between the 1905 revolution and World War I: decadence and futurism. First, we examine everyday decadence, including popular entertainment. The lecture then looks at "decadent" attitudes visible in literature and art: the evocation of love and beauty, sensualism, as well as a preoccupation with darkness, morbidity, and evil. The lecture next explores Russian futurist poetry and art: the iconoclastic attempt to "shock the philistine" in both everyday style and art and the attraction to primitivism and abstraction. Finally, the embrace of modernity is considered. The lecture concludes by considering the evaluation of futurism as ambiguous, as expressing a "characteristic joyful horror."

Outline

I. One may speak of the last decade before World War I as the Russian fin-de-siècle.
- **A.** We know, of course, that these were, in fact, the final years of the old order in Russia.
- **B.** But these years also felt like a turning point; many at the time saw them as years of decadent decline and crisis.
- **C.** Scholars have long argued about where Russia was heading from 1905 to 1914 and about what might have happened had Russia not experienced the strain and devastation of World War I.
  - **1.** "Optimists" argue that collapse and revolution were not inevitable, that important reforms and progress were being made.
  - **2.** "Pessimists," by contrast, note the increase in political and social tensions even before the war.
  - **3.** What is perhaps most salient about these years is neither progress nor crisis alone but their coexistence, the contradictoriness of these times.

II. Many have noted the cultural "decadence" of early twentieth-century Russia.
- **A.** Traditions of order and morality seemed to be challenged everywhere.
- **B.** Most visible was the everyday decadence in daily life.
  - **1.** Both hooliganism and suicide were widely viewed as signs of the moral decline and disorder among the lower classes.
  - **2.** Many contemporaries were no less dismayed by the public cultural life of the middle classes, especially the proliferation of "low-brow" cultural entertainments.
- **C.** This was a contradictory decadence.
  - **1.** Some were outraged and frightened by this disintegration of order and morality.
  - **2.** Others felt liberated by the lack of restraint and the new possibilities.
- **D.** Decadence, and the ambivalence of its meanings, is clearly visible in much of the modern art and literature of these years (the "Silver Age").
  - **1.** Amoral aestheticism, the escapist love of beauty for its own sake, was a frequent theme in poetry, especially the work of Anna Akhmatova and other Acmeists.
  - **2.** A related theme was sensualism, a fascination with physical beauty and even sexuality. An important expression of this was the famous Ballets Russes.
  - **3.** Another related, and more extreme, theme was a fascination with the morbid: with images of death, evil, melancholy, and despair.

III. The artists who called themselves "futurists" reveal another revealing—and contradictory—face of the cultural life of this period.
- **A.** Motivated by a desire to subvert the present in the name of the future, these artists did all they could to be provocative and outrageous.
  - **1.** The most famous statement of this futurist challenge was the 1912 Manifesto of the Moscow Futurists, called "A Slap in the Face of Public Taste."

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. This manifesto attacked all of Russia's established culture as old-fashioned, crass, and cheap.

B. The futurists sought "to shock the philistine" (the bourgeois), starting with the way they dressed and behaved in public.
1. Vladimir Maiakovskii appeared in bright shirts with a radish in his buttonhole.
2. David Burliuk might paint pictures on his face while wearing a top hat.
3. Futurist performances also featured a lively, and sometimes insulting, interaction with the audience.

C. Above all, futurists tried to "shock the philistines" in their art.

D. The most important expression of this effort to shock was the use of transrational language—or simply *zaum* (beyond the mind).
1. Partly, *zaum* represented a sort of "iconoclastic game."
2. These sounds were also deliberately savage.
3. *Zaum* echoed and embraced the confusion and chaos of modern life.
4. *Zaum* was an attempt to express things that could not be conveyed through a conventional use of words.

E. Futurists carried over this "savage" attack on philistine civilization into the visual arts.

F. This savagery is visible, for example, in the primitivist paintings of Mikhail Larionov.
1. Larionov, like many artists and writers, was fascinated with images of the East.
2. He used color in a way that challenged conventional aesthetics.
3. The emotions expressed were strong, vital, wild, primitive, and true.

G. The work of Kazimir Malevich is another example of artistic futurism.
1. Malevich sometimes presents an explicit iconoclastic challenge to high culture (by juxtaposing a cow and a violin, for example).
2. But his series of abstract paintings were his most famous challenge to conventional thinking.

IV. These artists also embraced the vitality and possibility of the modern world.

A. An infatuation with the objects of modernity is evident in futurist writing and painting.
1. Poets and painters insisted that true beauty lay not in pastoral scenes or still lifes, but in machines, iron, and skyscrapers.
2. Some artists followed the logic of this to its end and introduced modern objects into their paintings.

B. Although futurists appeared to be optimistic and hopeful, to believe in the modern world and in the future, there were signs of doubt.
1. The contemporary symbolist poet Aleksandr Blok described Russian futurism as "reflecting in its foggy mirror a characteristic joyful horror."
2. These contradictions emerge clearly in what was probably the most famous futurist production of the prewar period, the opera *Victory over the Sun*.
3. In this work, the future wins the struggle between the forces of the future and those of the past, but many people find it impossible to live or even breathe in the new world.

Essential Reading:

W. Bruce Lincoln, *Between Heaven and Hell: The Story of a Thousand Years of Artistic Life in Russia* (New York, 1998), chapter 13.

Supplementary Reading:

Vladimir Markov, *Russian Futurism: A History* (Berkeley, 1968).

Camilla Grey, *The Russian Experiment in Art, 1863–1922* (London, 1986).

Questions to Consider:

1. Do you agree with optimistic or pessimistic assessments of the direction of Russian life between 1905 and 1914? Were the prewar years a time of progress leading to lessening political and social tensions or a time of deepening crisis?
2. Was artistic and cultural iconoclasm an expression of moral crisis or vitality? Either way, what philosophical values underlay what was called decadence and futurism?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Four
Fin-de-Siècle Culture—The Religious Renaissance

Scope: This lecture looks at another side of Russian cultural life in the decades before the first world war: the widespread religious revival. The lecture begins by looking at the nature of Russian Orthodoxy, especially what has been called its "sacramental mysticism." We consider the influential ideas of Vladimir Soloviev, including his notions of Godmanhood and Sophia. The lecture then explores the various movements known together as "God-seeking": ethical idealism, mysticism, and the occult. Marxist "God-building" is examined, as are movements within the Church. Next, the lecture considers popular religious movements and the rise of sectarianism. Finally, we examine the growing interest in the spiritual among writers and artists, expressed especially in literary symbolism and in the paintings of Kazimir Malevich.

Outline

I. Religion and spirituality were at the heart of the contradictory sense of crisis, possibility, and searching in the Russian fin de siècle, especially between 1905 and 1914.

- **A.** Starting in the 1890s, and especially after the 1905 revolution, Russia experienced what has been called a "religious renaissance," much of it outside, or even opposed to, the established Church.
- **B.** In many ways, the term "religious renaissance" is too feeble to describe the passionate and often troubled nature of this spiritual ferment.
- **C.** Better is Alexander Blok's image of an upheaval of emotion and fear through the "crusted lava" of civilization.

II. First, we must look at Russian Orthodoxy itself.

- **A.** It is important to note that the English word "orthodoxy" does not convey the sense of the Russian "*Pravoslavie*," meaning the correct way to glorify God; the focus is on ceremony, not theology
- **B.** The Russian Primary Chronicle tells a revealing story about the reasons the Grand Prince Vladimir chose Christianity for Russia in the tenth century.
  - **1.** It was decided that Russia needed to adopt one of the religions of one of the major empires that it had dealings with.
  - **2.** Vladimir sent emissaries to the Muslim Bulgars, the Catholic Holy Roman Empire, and the Eastern Orthodox Church in Constantinople.
  - **3.** The emissaries, the Chronicles say, were dazzled by the glory and beauty of the Orthodox churches and their ceremonies such that they reported "we knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth."
  - **4.** This emphasis on beauty and feeling says much about the nature of Orthodoxy.
- **C.** Orthodoxy, it has been said, places particular emphasis on the "mysticism of the sacrament."
  - **1.** This sense of the presence of the sacred in holy objects is visible in frescoes, mosaics, and icons that covered every wall of the Greek and, later, the Russian Church.
  - **2.** It is visible in the rich and beautiful liturgy.
  - **3.** It is visible in the sense of the sacred in a plenitude of objects: wine, water, oil, bread, fruit, homes, fields, and nature.
  - **4.** All of these were efforts to create "heaven on earth."
  - **5.** The emphasis on the sacramental can be seen also in a lesser stress put on the historical Christ and his teachings.

III. A major influence on this spiritual renaissance was the philosopher and poet Vladimir Soloviev.

- **A.** One of his key ideas was the mystical ideal of the unity of all things—known as "All-Unity"—and of the movement of the world toward unity.
- **B.** His notion of "Godmanhood" was even more influential.
  - **1.** For Soloviev, the essence of Christianity was mystical, not ethical.
  - **2.** The key mystical moment was the appearance of Christ in the world.
  - **3.** This was also prophetic, pointing to human perfection and the unity of the spiritual and the material.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

C. Closely related to this idea was the idea of Sophia, of divine Wisdom:
  1. Soloviev adapted this idea from the Old Testament, Jewish mystical writings, seventeenth-century philosophers, and the Orthodox tradition.
  2. Sophia represented not only divine wisdom but also the incarnation of the ideal of All-Unity—of God's Word made flesh—and the promise of the perfection toward which humanity is striving.

IV. In the years after 1905, mystical and spiritual idealism became more pervasive than ever before, such that many spoke of a "God-seeking" movement.
  A. God-seeking was a sign of the widespread desire for spiritual meaning, as well as a sign of the crisis of the times.
  B. Many intellectuals sought to reemphasize ethics and their spiritual roots, including both neo-Kantianism and Tolstoyanism.
  C. Many others were more oriented to mysticism, including theosophy, occult spirituality, interest in Eastern religions, and apocalypticism.
  D. Marxist "God-building" echoed these trends in its efforts to bring to Marxism emotional passion and moral certainty.
  E. The Church, too, was changing in these years.
    1. Individual priests joined intellectuals in discussing religion and spirituality.
    2. Some clergy talked about the need to free the Church from state control.
    3. Some individual priests, notably the charismatic Father John of Kronstadt, innovated in tradition to get back to the essence of Orthodox spirituality.
  F. We also see in these years popular movements of spiritual renaissance.
    1. Beginning in the 1890s, we see a steady growth of Tolstoyan communities among urban and rural poor.
    2. We see a growing interest in various new religious groups ("sects").
    3. Baptists and other Protestant denominations were attracting followers.
    4. Individual mystics, healers, and charismatic preachers attracted attention.
    5. Most influential in these years were the St. Petersburg and Moscow Brethren, who attracted thousands of workers and other lower-class Russians with their message of sobriety, self-respect, and a rich inner life.
  G. Among peasants, as well, we see the growth of interest in spiritual-ethical literature, the popularity of "cults," an upsurge in pilgrimage to sacred sites, and stories of healings and miracles.

V. We see much the same nonconformist searching for personal spiritual meaning in art and literature during these years.
  A. In literature, symbolism thrived.
    1. Symbolism shared the widespread discontent with rationalism and positivism.
    2. Symbolism also reflected a certain dark, pessimistic mood.
    3. Even urban lower-class writers were affected by contradictory anxieties and hopes: suffering and deep melancholy mixed with hopes for salvation.
  B. In the visual arts, we see this same spiritual searching in the work of Kazimir Malevich.
    1. When still painting representational works, Malevich painted images of Christ on the Cross.
    2. Increasingly, Malevich's efforts to express his spiritual feelings took him beyond mere representation.
    3. As abstraction, these works were an effort to express non-rational, emotional, and spiritual truths.
    4. His famous *Black Square* functioned much like an icon.
    5. Other images significantly took the shape of a cross, a symbol of suffering, as well as the promise of salvation.

Supplementary Reading:

George Kline, *Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia* (Chicago, 1968).

Christopher Read, *Religion, Revolution, and the Russian Intelligentsia* (Totowa, 1979).

Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture* (Ithaca, 1997).

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Mark Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Ithaca, 2002), chapter 6.

Questions to Consider:

1. What do you think were the main reasons that so many people began to turn to various forms of spirituality in the years after 1905? Was this another sign of Russia's crisis or of its progress?
2. How positive and hopeful were these religious expressions and movements?

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Biographical Notes

Alexander I (Aleksandr Pavlovich, 1777–1825; emperor 1801–1825). Son of Paul I. He alternately fought and befriended Napoleon I but, ultimately (1813–1815), helped form the coalition that defeated the emperor of the French. Initially influenced by the liberalism of his Swiss tutor, Alexander established an "Unofficial Committee" to discuss major political and social reforms and enacted a number of preliminary reforms. Always concerned with maintaining order, he grew increasingly anxious about the dangers of liberal reform. Toward the end of his life, Alexander I steadily lost confidence even in rationalistic order as an ideal and became increasingly influenced by religious mysticism. He was succeeded by his brother Nicholas I.

Alexander II (Aleksandr Nikolaevich, 1818–1881; emperor 1855–1881). Emperor. Son and successor of Nicholas I. Alexander II initiated a major program of modernization and reform, including the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. These reforms were combined with limitations to control the consequences of reform. Many were dissatisfied with these limits. A political crisis erupted during the years 1879 to 1881, caused by failure in the Russo-Turkish war in the Balkans, renewed peasant unrest, and a growing terrorist movement. In 1881, Alexander II was assassinated by a member of the People's Will, the terrorist wing of the populist movement. He was succeeded by his son Alexander III.

Alexander III (Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, 1845–1894; emperor 1881–1894). Alexander III's response to the assassination of his father was to reverse many of the reforms his father had initiated. Working with his close adviser Konstantin Pobedonostsev, Alexander III increased the repressive powers of the police, tightened censorship, controlled education, limited the power of the zemstvos and the judiciary, increased the government's control over the peasants, subjected national minorities to forcible Russification, and persecuted religious minorities, especially the Jews. His Minister of Finance, Sergei Witte, however, used government pressure to stimulate the industrial development of the country. Alexander III was succeeded by his son Nicholas II.

Anna (Anna Ioannova, 1693–1740; empress 1730–1740). Daughter of Ivan V, Peter I's half-brother and co-tsar until his death, and niece of Peter the Great. When emperor Peter II (1727–1730) died, bringing to an end the male Romanov line, the aristocratic Supreme Privy Council, the de facto ruling body, offered her the throne. She accepted the proposal as well as its stipulation that she agree to "conditions" placing much real power in the council's hands. Soon after taking the throne, she abrogated the conditions, abolished the Privy Council, and reestablished autocracy. In practice, she left much of the day-to-day government activity in the hands of her lover, Ernst Johann Biron, and a small group of German advisers. The policies of her reign became increasingly brutal, though she was also known for her lavish entertainments at court.

Vissarion Grigorevich Belinskii (1811–1848). Prominent Russian literary critic and leading Westernizer. Born the son of a doctor, he was one of the first important non-noble members of the intelligentsia. Writing mainly literary criticism for influential journals in the 1830s and 1840s, he was Russia's first professional literary critic. His life was brief but lived with emotional intensity and strong moral commitment, true to the Romantic spirit of the age. As a literary critic, he insisted that good literature was that which best served "truth"—both in reflecting the realities of the world and in advocating true morals and principles. As a social critic, he was influential for his articulate critique of Russian society based on its failure to place sufficient value in the individual human being. He died of tuberculosis.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev (1906–1982; first secretary [after 1966, general secretary] of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [CPSU], 1964–1983; Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet [head of state], 1977–1982). Educated as an engineer, Brezhnev held a variety of party posts starting in the 1930s, his career flourishing under Stalin's regime. After Khrushchev was forced from power in 1964, he led the Soviet Union for eighteen years (1964–1982), initially through a "collective leadership" with Aleksei Kosygin, then alone. Stability was the guiding principle of his domestic politics. In international affairs, he pursued détente with the West. The Soviet welfare state developed extensively during his time in power, but so did privileges for the elite. Partly due to heavy focus on military industrial production, other sectors of the economy suffered, leading to stagnation and, possibly, decline in the standard of living.

Nikolai Ivanovich Bukharin (1888–1938). Bolshevik, Marxist theoretician and economist, prominent party leader. Joined the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party in 1906. After the February 1917 revolution, Bukharin returned to Russia, was elected to the Bolshevik Central Committee, and after the Bolsheviks took power, became

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

editor of *Pravda*. In 1918, Bukharin briefly led an opposition group, the Left Communists, which opposed the Brest-Litovsk treaty and proposed to transform the war into a revolutionary war to spread Communism to Europe. After Lenin's death in 1924, Bukharin became a full member of the Politburo. A strong believer in the New Economic Policy as a strategy for building socialism without violence and force and in accord with the natural development of the market, Bukharin was initially allied with Stalin against Trotsky and the Left. In 1928, Stalin denounced Bukharin and his supporters as a "Right Deviation" and expelled him from the Politburo. After recanting his views, Bukharin was partially rehabilitated. Arrested in 1937, Bukharin was expelled from the party, tried in the last great purge trial in 1938, forced to confess, and executed. In 1988, he was posthumously reinstated as a member of the Communist Party.

Catherine I (Ekaterina Alekseevna, born Marta Skavronska, 1684–1727; empress 1725–1727). Of likely Lithuanian background, orphaned at the age of three, raised by a Lutheran pastor in the Baltic region, seized by conquering Russian soldiers during the Northern War, she became a servant in the house of Peter I's associate Aleksandr Menshikov. After being Menshikov's mistress, she became the mistress of the tsar, who married her (his second wife) in 1712 after she converted to Orthodoxy. When Peter died without naming a successor, though having set up a new law that the emperor was free to appoint whomever he wished, Menshikov and the imperial guards placed Catherine on the throne. Menshikov played a dominant role in her brief reign, as did the Supreme Privy Council, which Catherine established.

Catherine II the Great (Ekaterina Aleeksevna, born Sophie Augusta of Anhalt-Zerbst, 1729–1796; empress 1762–1796). Born in Stettin, Germany, Catherine converted to Orthodoxy in 1744 and married the future emperor Peter III in 1745. After her husband was murdered in 1762, with her willing support, she became empress. Catherine increased Russia's power and prestige through skillful diplomacy and by extending Russia's boundaries. Although inspired by Enlightenment ideals, clearly visible in her Instructions to the Legislative Commission she appointed in 1767 to consider reform, Catherine did not believe that Russia was ready for liberty or democracy and held firmly to her absolutist power. Nevertheless, she undertook numerous major reforms, including codifying the laws, restructuring the central administration, encouraging non-state service by nobles, promoting education and culture, allowing private publishing, and developing the economy. Although she had many lovers, only Count Grigorii Orlov and Prince Grigorii Potemkin had significant influence in government affairs.

Petr Iakovlevich Chaadaev (1794–1856). Writer and intellectual. Born in a family of wealthy landowners, Chaadaev studied at Moscow University but left to serve in the army in 1812 without completing his studies. In 1829, he undertook his main philosophical effort, the *Philosophical Letters*, written in French. The first letter was published in Russian in 1836 in the cultural journal *Teleskop* (*The Telescope*). This work, highly critical of Russia's cultural backwardness, inspired widespread debate among educated Russians. The government of Nicholas I declared Chaadaev insane for his critical views and placed him under house arrest. In 1837, he wrote "Apology of a Madman," in which he retreated from his stated despair about Russia's future and argued for the advantages of backwardness for Western-orientated progress.

Nikolai Gavrilovich Chernyshevskii (1828–1889) Radical journalist and political activist. Son of a poor priest. A Westernizer, Chernyshevskii shared the common belief in the central importance of the individual human being. Unlike the earlier generation of the intelligentsia, however, he was convinced of the need to ground ideology in science more than morality. In all his writings, he made clear his radical opposition to the existing social and political order. After his arrest by the tsarist police for sedition in 1862, Chernyshevskii was sentenced to seven years in prison and hard labor and lifelong exile to Siberia. His political novel *What Is to Be Done?*, written in prison and published in 1863, exerted a major influence on Russian revolutionaries, including Lenin.

Elizabeth (Elizaveta Petrovna, 1709–1761; empress 1741–1761). Daughter of Peter the Great and Catherine I. Supported by members of the Russian court who hoped to reduce German domination at court, Elizabeth seized power from the infant Ivan VI and the regent, his mother, Anna, in a coup. Elizabeth endeavored to bring a spirit of culture and beauty to Russia and to demonstrate to the world that Russia was not a savage land. Many of Russia's great palaces were constructed during her reign. She also restored the Senate created by her father and is often credited with returning to the principles and traditions of Peter I by rationalizing government, encouraging cultural development, stimulating the economy, and demonstrating Russia's importance in the world.

Georgii Appollonovich Gapon (1870–1906). Priest and labor organizer. Born into a peasant family in Ukraine. He was influenced by the religious and moral ideals of Lev Tolstoi, causing him to become increasingly critical of mere ritual and to devote his efforts to working with the urban poor. In 1902–1903, he assisted the head of the special

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

section of the Department of Police (Okhrana) in establishing an official labor organization in St. Petersburg to undermine socialist agitation among workers while promoting workers' needs and interests. In 1904, he established his own legal workers' organization, the Assembly of Russian Factory and Mill Workers. In early January 1905, Gapon helped draft a petition to the emperor in the name of workers, which was read at mass meetings and carried in a procession of workers headed by Gapon on January 9. The procession was fired on by troops. After this "Bloody Sunday," Gapon escaped abroad with the help of the Socialist Revolutionary (SR) party. In March 1906, after allegedly attempting on behalf of the police to discover the membership of the SR party's terrorist "fighting organization," he was tried by a party tribunal and hanged.

Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev (1931– ; general secretary of the CPSU 1985–1991; president of the Soviet Union 1990–1991). The son of peasants, in 1952 Gorbachev entered the law school of Moscow State University and became a member of the Communist Party. After graduation, he held a number of posts in the Komsomol and in party organizations in Stavropol, rising to become first secretary of the regional party committee in 1970. He was named a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1971, became a candidate member of the Politburo in 1979, and became a full member in 1980. In 1985, after the death of Konstantin Chernenko, he was named general secretary with a mandate to reform a stagnant economy and a society marked by what he called "spiritual crisis." From 1989 to 1990, he was chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and, from 1990 to 1991, President. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1990. Gorbachev's policies of *glasnost'* and *perestroika* brought about increases in democracy and civic freedom, but did not succeed in stimulating the stagnant economy nor in satisfying the desires of many for greater freedom and democracy, which led to growing instability. In August 1991, conservative Communists arrested Gorbachev and seized power. When the coup failed, the Russian government banned the Communist Party and joined other republics in quitting the USSR. In December 1991, Gorbachev resigned as head of the USSR, which had effectively ceased to exist. He remained in Russia and established, mainly with income from his publications in the West, the Gorbachev Foundation, a think-tank based in Moscow. He remains active as a writer and public speaker.

Maksim Gor'kii (Gorky) (pseudonym of Aleksei Maksimovich Peshkov; 1858–1938). Writer and critic. Born into a provincial lower-middle-class family, orphaned at a young age, his youth was filled with wandering and manual labor, as well as gradual political radicalization. Gor'kii began his career as a professional writer in the early 1890s. His stories and plays, filled with sympathetic images of lower-class life but also critical of the slavish submissiveness and fatalism of the masses and, thus, idealizing vital individuals, became extremely popular. In 1908–1909, Gor'kii was one of the leaders in the Marxist "God-Building" movement. In 1917–1918, he published an influential series of essays on politics, culture, and morality in the newspaper *Novoe vremia* (*New Times*), entitled "Untimely Thoughts," which offered an ethical critique of the revolution. In October 1921, Gor'kii left Russia, ostensibly for his health. He returned to live in the USSR in 1933, evidently reconciled to the Soviet system and openly supporting Stalin and his policies.

Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen (Gertsen in Russian; 1812–1870). Political thinker, activist, and writer. A leading Westernizer and early Russian socialist. The illegitimate son of a Moscow nobleman and a young German household servant, Herzen attended Moscow University, where he became involved in philosophical study circles (*kruzhki*). In 1834, his circle was broken up as seditious and Herzen was sent to the provinces as a civil servant. In 1840, he returned to Moscow, where he was again involved in the circles of the intelligentsia and, together with Belinskii and others, elaborated the ideals of Westernism and socialism. In 1847, Herzen left Russia for freer conditions in Western Europe, never to return. He settled first in Paris and later in England, where he set up the first free Russian press abroad and a weekly journal, *Kolokol* (*The Bell*, 1857–1862), which was officially banned but widely read in Russia. At the heart of his work was the notion of the essential freedom and dignity of the individual person, notwithstanding the pressures of nature and history.

Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804–1860). A leading Slavophile writer and intellectual. Born in Moscow into a wealthy noble family, Khomiakov was raised in a religious environment and grew increasingly religious as he got older, in contrast to the atheism of Westernizer intellectuals. He was an officer in the army from 1822–1825 and 1828–1829, living in Western Europe in between, then withdrew to the life of a landowner. He attended Moscow University but was largely self-taught, especially in theology and philosophy. His doctrine of *sobornost'* (natural spiritual community) was central to Slavophile thinking.

Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev (1894–1971; first secretary of the CPSU 1953–1964; also chairman of the council of ministers [head of government] 1958–1964). Born in a family of peasants, Khrushchev was a metal worker

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

before the revolution. He joined the party in 1918 and fought in the Red Army during the civil war. He was active in the Ukrainian party organization in the 1920s. As an active supporter of Stalin, Khrushchev was promoted rapidly in the party leadership, becoming a member of the Politburo in 1939. After Stalin's death in 1953, Khrushchev won the struggle for succession. Khrushchev is best known for his policies of de-Stalinization and "peaceful coexistence" with the West. He sought to revitalize the system with greater rank-and-file activism and a more consumer-oriented economy. Khrushchev was forced to resign in 1964, in the wake of economic and foreign policy failures, as well as the discontent of the elite, whose interests were often undermined by his reforms.

Petr Lavrovich Lavrov (pseudonym of Petr Lavrovich Mirtov, 1823–1900). Populist philosopher and writer. From a landed family, Lavrov graduated from an artillery school in St. Petersburg in 1842 and taught mathematics in St. Petersburg from 1844 to 1866. Becoming involved in antigovernment activities in 1857, he joined a secret revolutionary society and edited an underground newspaper. Arrested and sentenced to internal banishment in 1867, he escaped to Paris, where he participated in the Paris Commune of 1871. Lavrov edited various émigré publications and organized discussion circles among Russian émigrés. His writings, especially his influential *Historical Letters* (published in 1869–1870), articulated a practical philosophy at the center of which stood the humanistic concern for individual dignity and rights (*lichnost'*—see Glossary), the duty of "critically thinking individuals" to act on behalf of society as a whole, and the essential moral foundations of truth. His writings helped provide the theoretical foundation for the activities of the Russian radical populist organizations in the late nineteenth century.

Vladimir Il'ich Lenin (pseudonym of Vladimir Il'ich Ulianov, 1870–1924; leader of the Bolshevik [later Communist] party 1903–1924; chairman of the Sovnarkom [Soviet government] 1917–1924). Revolutionary, political writer, leader of the Bolshevik party and the Soviet government. Lenin was born into a moderately well-to-do family in Simbirsk, a small town on the Volga River, where his father served as an education official. Following the execution of his older brother for the attempted assassination of Alexander III, Lenin became involved in revolutionary activities. Before the revolution of 1917, he lived primarily abroad, in Munich, London, Geneva, and Paris. In 1895, he helped establish the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class. At a meeting of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party in 1903, when the party split into two factions over questions of organization and strategy, Lenin led the Bolshevik faction. A prolific writer, Lenin was the leading advocate of a vision of revolution led by professional revolutionaries and daring to act creatively to seize the opportunities history provided. After the February revolution, Lenin received permission to travel across Germany in a sealed train to return to Russia. In October, he led the Bolsheviks in the successful overthrow of the Provisional Government and became the leader of the Soviet government. He died in 1924, two years after a stroke left him incapacitated. His embalmed body was placed in a mausoleum on Moscow's Red Square.

Count Mikhail Tarielovich Loris-Melikov (1825–1888). Tsarist government official. Born in Tiflis, the son of an Armenian merchant, Loris-Melikov served as governor of the Terek region in the Caucasus from 1863 to 1875, commanded an army corps in Turkey during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, and was governor-general of the plague-ridden lower Volga region in 1879. Alexander II appointed him chairman of a special commission to suppress the revolutionary movement but also to prepare a reform program for the country. In 1880, Alexander II named him minister of the interior and head of the Imperial Police Department. His program of reforms combined forceful suppression of dissent with reforms designed to lessen discontent, including a consultative national assembly. The project was approved in principle by Alexander II, but the emperor was assassinated before it was formally enacted, and it was rejected by the new emperor, Alexander III. Loris-Melikov resigned his post and retired to Nice.

Vladimir Vladimirovich Maiakovskii (Mayakovsky) (1893–1930). Futurist and revolutionary poet. Joined the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party at the age of fifteen and was repeatedly jailed for subversive activity. He started to write poetry during solitary confinement in 1909. On his release, he attended the Moscow Art School and joined the iconoclastic futurist movement. Maiakovskii's poetry was self-assertive and defiant in form and content but also explored the tragedy of unrequited love and discontent with the world. Maiakovskii embraced the Bolshevik revolution and wrote many revolutionary poems and works of propaganda. In the 1920s, he completed two satirical plays aimed at troubling aspects of Soviet life. In 1930, disappointed in love, increasingly alienated from Soviet reality, and denied a visa to travel abroad, he committed suicide.

L. Martov (pseudonym of Iulii Osipovich Tsederbaum, 1873–1923). Revolutionary, political writer, leader of the Mensheviks. Martov grew up in a Jewish family in Odessa at a time of considerable discrimination and persecution.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

In the 1880s, his family moved to St. Petersburg, where Martov became involved in the student movement and embraced Marxism. He was active in Vilna as a member of the Jewish socialist Bund and, in 1895, joined Lenin in forming the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class. Arrested in 1896, after three years in Siberia, he left Russia for Switzerland, where he joined Lenin as an editor of the socialist paper *Iskra*. At the second congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party in 1903, Martov was the leading figure among those who would become known as Mensheviks, favoring a more open and democratic party. During 1917, he led a left-wing faction of Menshevik-Internationalists, who favored breaking with the Provisional Government and establishing a democratic Soviet government. After the Bolshevik revolution, he opposed many of the new regime's dictatorial measures but supported the government during the civil war. In 1920, Martov left Soviet Russia and edited the *Socialist Courier* in Berlin until his death.

Roi (Roy) Aleksandrovich Medvedev (1925–). Soviet historian and Marxist dissident. His father was arrested in 1938 and died in a labor camp, helping to spark Medvedev's lifelong interest in reexamining the Soviet political system and its history. After university, he worked as a teacher, school administrator, and editor before becoming a senior researcher at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in the 1960s. He was a member of the Communist Party from 1956 until his expulsion in 1969. From 1971, he worked as a freelance writer based in Moscow. His works, which reexamined Soviet political history from the period of the Russian revolution to the 1960s, could only be published abroad and smuggled back into the USSR. His most important book was *Let History Judge* in 1971, dealing with the crimes of the Stalin period. Unlike most dissidents, Medvedev believed in the possibility of revitalizing socialism and returning to its healthier pre-Stalinist roots.

Nicholas I (Nikolai Pavlovich, 1796–1855; emperor 1825–1855). Nicholas I came to the throne amidst the Decembrist rebellion, which broke out in the midst of the public uncertainty about the succession following the death of Alexander I, given the secret agreement of Nicholas's older brother, Constantine, not to take the throne due a morganatic marriage. His reign was characterized by regimentation, militarism, and repression. Nicholas was also deeply religious and preoccupied with moral discipline and virtue. As ruler, he struggled unceasingly against the rising tide of revolution in Western Europe, implemented intense Russification policies throughout the empire, and repressed dissident cultural and intellectual trends. His special political police agency (the Third Department) did much to create a police state in Russia. His rule was inspired by three key principles: Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality.

Nicholas II (Nikolai Aleksandrovich, 1866–1918; emperor 1894–1917). Succeeded to the throne after the death of his father, Alexander III. His rule was characterized by a mixture of continued economic progress (as well as periodic crises) and efforts to contain the effects of modernization. In particular, Nicholas resisted demands for more participatory government and civil rights. During the 1905 revolution, he was compelled to establish a Duma (parliament) and ensure fundamental civil rights, though he tried in the following years to limit these reforms. During World War I, he took personal command of the war effort. He was consistently inspired by an ideology of autocracy that combined a conviction about the necessity and righteousness of the absolute power of the tsar with a faith in a special bond of love and devotion between tsar and people. Tradition, discipline, duty, religion, and love were among his highest values. In the midst of war and revolution, Nicholas II abdicated in March 1917, bringing to an end the Romanov dynasty. He was executed, along with his family and close servants, in Ekaterinburg in July 1918.

Nikolai Ivanovich Novikov (1744–1818) Writer and publisher. Born into a family of old service gentry, Novikov was educated at Moscow University, then joined the Izmailovskii Guards Regiment. In 1767, he was selected as a secretary for Catherine the Great's Legislative Commission. Rather than continuing in the army or state service, he retired to devote himself to literary and civic activism as a publisher, printer, editor, and writer. He established an influential series of satirical journals in which he criticized unenlightened conditions in Russian life. In 1775, Novikov became a Freemason and focused increasing attention on inward transformation, combined with civic service to others. His journal, *Morning Light*, begun in 1777, advocated civic virtue, chastised imperfection and vice, and championed the idea that human beings are made in God's image and, hence, equal in rights and dignity. In 1779, he took over the lease of the Moscow University Press and, after the legalization of private publishing in 1783, set up his own firm. In 1792, the government arrested Novikov, closed his publishing house, and condemned him without trial as a "subversive" to fifteen years' imprisonment. He was released four years later a broken man, physically and financially. He turned in his final years to mysticism.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Paul I (Pavel Petrovich, 1754–1801; emperor 1796–1801). Despite Catherine II's apparent intention to name Paul's son Alexander her heir, rather than her son Paul, he succeeded her when she died in 1796. Paul repealed the decree issued by Peter the Great that had given each monarch the right to choose his successor and established a definite order of succession within the male line of the Romanov family. Paul attempted to revive the tradition of the all-powerful autocrat and to increase militarization in accordance with the Prussian model. He reversed many of Catherine's policies, reestablishing centralized administrative agencies she had abolished, increasing bureaucratic control in local government, and revoking the Charter of the Nobility. His frequently capricious conduct; his obsessive militarization of all aspects of life; his foreign policy, which alienated Russia from most of the great powers; and his restrictions on the autonomy and authority of the nobility led to widespread dissatisfaction among the elites. Paul was assassinated by palace guards, with the knowledge and tacit approval of his son and heir, Alexander.

Peter I the Great (Petr Alekseevich, 1672–1725; co-tsar 1682–1696; tsar 1696–1725; emperor titled "the Great" 1721–1725). Peter I fought wars with his neighbors almost constantly throughout his reign. The result was the considerable expansion of Russia and its self-identification as an empire. An exceptional individual and ruler, he devoted himself to transforming Russia into a powerful nation with a European civilization. His reforms were extensive: He redesigned the central governmental administration, created a Senate to advise on policy, reorganized the growing empire geographically, put the Church under state control, created a single "Table of Ranks" designed to ensure that rank reflected service and merit more than birth, organized the urban population into guilds and corporations, established factories and other industries, reformed the tax structure, and stimulated a Western intellectual life (especially among the elite). He also altered the law of succession to enable the monarch to choose the most able individual to succeed rather than leave this to the irrational chance of birth, though he died without formally naming a successor.

Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev (1827–1907). Tsarist government official and conservative political philosopher. The youngest son of a Russian Orthodox priest and literature professor, Pobedonostsev was educated at home and in a school of law in St. Petersburg from 1841 to 1846. He taught law at Moscow University, served in the Moscow Senate, wrote and published. In the 1860s, he became tutor to the tsar's sons, including the heir, Alexander III. He was appointed to the Senate in 1868 and to the State Council in 1872. In 1880, he was named Chief Procurator (secular head) of the Holy Synod, a position he held until the fall of 1905. He also tutored the future Nicholas II. A strong believer in autocracy, he denounced the eighteenth-century Enlightenment view of the perfectibility of man and society and, therefore, supported paternalistic and authoritarian government. In 1881, he persuaded Alexander III to reject the reforms proposed by Loris-Melikov and influenced domestic policies throughout the 1880s. His hatred and fear of constitutional and democratic government, freedom of the press, religious freedom, trial by jury, and free secular education was best expressed in a collection of essays, *Moskovskii sbornik* (*Moscow Collection*), published in 1896.

Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin (1799–1837). Poet, novelist, and dramatist, often viewed as a cultural symbol of Russia. Born in Moscow in 1799, Pushkin's ancestry reached back into the old Muscovite nobility but also to a captive Abyssinian prince given to Peter the Great. In 1811, he entered the new Imperial Lyceum at Tsarskoe selo, where he was trained to enter the civil service. While there, Pushkin began to write poetry that was innovative and popular. In 1817, he took a post in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg. He expressed dissident political views in some of his writings, for which he was exiled in 1820 from the capital. In 1826, Pushkin was allowed to return to Moscow. Although his work was censored and he was put under observation by the police, it was in this period that he began to write his most important works. In 1831, Pushkin married, settled again in St. Petersburg, and took up government service. His desire to continue writing came into conflict with his court position, and his petitions to be allowed to resign were all refused. He died in 1837 from wounds suffered in a duel. This transformed his weakening reputation into that of a cultural idol, as the supreme "manifestation of the Russian spirit."

Grigorii Efimovich Rasputin (real name, Grigorii Efimovich Novykh, 1864–1916). Siberian peasant and mystic. Born a peasant in Tobolsk Province in Siberia, Rasputin acquired a reputation as a *starets* (holy man) with the ability to heal the sick and predict the future. He also had a reputation for licentiousness, for which he was called Rasputin (from the Russian word for debauchery). Nicholas II and his wife Aleksandra, seeking spiritual counsel, as well help with the hemophilia of their son Aleksei, heir to the throne, invited Rasputin to court in 1905, where he gained considerable popularity and influence, especially among women. During the war, with Nicholas at the front, Rasputin's political advice to Alexandra, who advised her husband, was often heeded. His political influence and his boasting and debauchery tarnished the reputation of the imperial family. He was killed in December 1916 in a

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

conspiracy by Prince Feliks Iusupov (a relative of Nicholas II), Vladimir Purishkevich (a conservative politician), and Grand Duke Dmitrii Pavlovich (the tsar's cousin)

Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov (1921–1989). Physicist and dissident. Sakharov won a doctorate in physics at the age of twenty-six and was admitted as a full member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences at age thirty-two. He helped develop the Soviet Union's first hydrogen bomb and was accorded many honors and privileges. But he also became increasingly critical of Soviet policies, including nuclear testing in the atmosphere. In 1968, he published an essay in the West, which called for nuclear arms reductions, predicted and approved of the integration of communist and capitalist systems in a form of democratic socialism, and criticized the increasing repression of Soviet dissidents. He became an increasingly outspoken advocate of human rights, civil liberties, and reform in the Soviet Union, as well as for rapprochement with noncommunist nations. In 1975, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace. He was increasingly the target of official censure and harassment. In 1980, after his denunciation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and his call for a world boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games, Sakharov was stripped of his honors and exiled to the closed city of Gor'kii. In December 1986, under Gorbachev, the government allowed Sakharov to return to Moscow. He was elected to the new Congress of People's Deputies in April 1989, where he was an outspoken and widely admired voice for liberal progress.

Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn (1918–). Writer and dissident. Born into a family of Cossack intellectuals, Solzhenitsyn studied mathematics at the University of Rostov and literature at Moscow State University by correspondence course. He fought in World War II, achieving the rank of captain, but in 1945, was arrested for writing a letter criticizing Stalin. He spent eight years in prisons and labor camps, followed by three years in exile. In 1956, he was allowed to settle in Riazan, where he taught mathematics and began to write. In 1962, during a cultural thaw, Solzhenitsyn's first major success, the prison camp story *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, appeared in print. By the late 1960s, he was facing increasing criticism and harassment. Defiant, he emerged as an eloquent critic of repressive government policies. After the publication of a collection of his short stories in 1963, he was denied further official publication of his work. His later works were produced as *samizdat* ("self-published") or published abroad. Novels published in these years, all of which criticized repressive and brutal aspects of the Soviet system, gained Solzhenitsyn an international reputation. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1970. In 1974, he was arrested, charged with treason, and exiled from the Soviet Union. From 1976 to 1994, he lived in an isolated estate outside the small town of Cavendish, Vermont. He returned to Russia in 1994. As a leading Soviet dissident, he rejected Western emphases on democracy, individual freedom, and urban modernity and, instead, favored a strong but benevolent state, drawing for its inspiration on Russia's political traditions and Orthodox Christian values. He continues to criticize Western materialism and Russian secularization.

Iosif (Joseph) Stalin (pseudonym of Iosif Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, 1879–1953; general secretary of the CPSU 1922–1953; chairman of the council of ministers 1941–1953). Revolutionary and Soviet leader. Born in Georgia, the son of a poor shoemaker. At the age of fourteen, Stalin was sent to an Orthodox seminary to be educated for the priesthood. Active already in socialist politics, he was expelled in 1899. He joined the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party. Stalin joined the Bolsheviks after the party split in 1903 and became a party leader in his native Transcaucasia. In 1912, he was made a member of the party's Central Committee. After the October revolution, he was named Commissar of Nationalities. During the civil war, Stalin served as a political commissar in the Red Army. In 1922, he was named general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party. He was also a member of the Politburo. During the debates and struggles for power in the 1920s, Stalin first allied with the pro-NEP faction to defeat Trotsky and the Left, then turned against Bukharin and the Right. In the late 1920s, he initiated a major and often brutal drive to end all remnants of capitalist economics and culture and to rapidly industrialize the Soviet Union. After a period of relative calm in the early 1930s, he initiated a bloody purge. After the invasion of the Soviet Union by the Nazis in 1939, Stalin increasingly took the stance of national leader, becoming head of the government in 1941. After the war, he initiated new repressive policies in economic and cultural life. Stalin died on March 5, 1953. His body was embalmed and placed alongside that of Lenin in the tomb in Red Square, where it lay until removed in 1956 on order from the new party leader Nikita Khrushchev.

Petr Arkadeevich Stolypin (1862–1911; prime minister 1906–1911). Tsarist government official. After serving as governor of Grodno and the Saratov provinces, he was appointed minister of the interior and prime minister in 1906, at a critical time following the 1905 revolution. Ideologically conservative but pragmatic, Stolypin combined far-reaching agrarian reforms to improve the legal and economic status of the peasantry (and reduce discontent) with repressive political policies meant to ensure political stability. He dismissed the oppositional first and second Dumas and, defying the constitution, rewrote the electoral law to limit the role in the parliament of liberals and

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

socialists. He arrested, jailed, exiled, and executed large numbers of revolutionaries. But he also introduced a number of important reforms to improve social conditions, especially for the peasantry. In 1906, he gave peasants the possibility of leaving the commune and setting up as independent peasant farmers, with the hope of creating a prosperous, stable, and loyally conservative class. Over the next few years, his policies, especially his frequent defiance of the new constitutional system, alienated even the moderate Right, which predominated in the Duma. In 1911, Stolypin was assassinated by a revolutionary.

Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi (Leo Tolstoy) (1828–1910). Writer. Born into a distinguished noble family, Tolstoi was educated at home and for three years at Kazan University, after which he returned to his estates and led a largely dissipated life in Moscow and Petersburg. In 1851, he joined the army and, in 1854, served as an officer in the Crimean War. While in the military, he began writing fiction, which he decided to pursue as a career after 1856. From the 1850s through the 1870s, he wrote some of Russia's (and the world's) most famous novels, including *War and Peace* (1865–1869) and *Anna Karenina* (1875–1877). From quite early, Tolstoi was obsessed with moral and personal self-perfection and the search for truth. Around 1878, Tolstoi experienced a religious crisis that resulted in a "conversion" to a truer Christianity, after which he devoted his life to propagating (and practicing) his religious views, which rejected the sacraments and the divinity of Christ in favor of a religion of Christian ethics based on a social ideal of simplicity, love, and nonviolence. He was excommunicated in 1901. In 1910, he fled his estate to take up the life of a pilgrim and hermit but soon fell ill and died while on the road. Not withstanding his official condemnation by government and Church, Tolstoi was one of the most widely admired individuals in Russia, including long after his death.

Lev Trotskii (Leon Trotsky) (pseudonym of Lev Davidovich Bronshtein, 1879–1940). Revolutionary, Soviet leader, and exiled dissident. Born in a Russified Jewish family, Trotskii attended school in Ukraine and briefly attended the University of Odessa. While a student, he was attracted to the socialist underground and to Marxism. In 1898, he was arrested for revolutionary activity and exiled to Siberia, from which he escaped abroad in 1902. At the second congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party in July 1903, Trotskii sided with the Mensheviks. During the 1905 revolution, he was a leader of the St. Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, for which he was again sent into Siberian exile and from which he again escaped abroad. Returning to Russia in May 1917, Trotskii assumed leadership of an independent left-wing faction. After the abortive July uprising, Trotskii was arrested. He joined the Bolshevik party and was elected to its Central Committee. In September, he was elected chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. In October, Trotskii took a leading role in planning and leading the Bolshevik seizure of power. In the new Soviet government, he was named commissar of foreign affairs (1917–1918), headed the delegation discussing peace with Germany at the Brest-Litovsk negotiations in 1918, then became commissar of war (1918–1925), in which capacity he founded and led the Red Army. He was also a member of the Politburo in 1919–1926. During the 1920s, Trotskii applied his belief in the creative value of coercion and of the need for a vanguard to economic and social programs, favoring state-directed industrialization to overcome Russia's backwardness. At the same time, he criticized authoritarianism, bureaucratization, and an emerging political culture of servility within the party as harmful to the building of socialism. Defeated in the debates and struggles for power in the mid-1920s, Trotsky was dismissed from his position as war commissar, from the Politburo, and in 1927, from the party. He was exiled first to Alma Ata in Central Asia (1928), then expelled from the country (1929). In 1940, a man believed to be a Soviet security police agent assassinated him in his home in Mexico City.

Nikolai Ivanovich Turgenev (1789–1871). Tsarist state official and Decembrist. Born into a cultured gentry family, Turgenev was educated at home, at Moscow University (where his father was director), and from 1808–1811, at the University of Göttingen. He found it painful to return home to Russia in 1812, distressed at his country's political and cultural backwardness and at the brutality of serfdom. After service with the Prussian government, under the reformer Baron von Stein, he served in the Russian State Council and the Ministry of Finance. He actively worked on plans for economic and social reform. Frustrated by efforts to convince the government to undertake reform, or even to allow private initiatives, Turgenev grew disappointed with Alexander I. In 1816, he was involved in discussions that led to the establishment of the first secret political society, the Union of Salvation. He was active in the successor Union of Welfare, where he advocated his abolitionist program. In 1821, he was involved in the decision to form a more secret organization, the Northern Society, which organized the uprising in December 1825, though Turgenev had left Russia for Western Europe in 1824. He was sentenced to death in absentia, though pardoned in 1855 by the new emperor Alexander II. While in Europe, he continued to advocate reform in Russia, especially the abolition of serfdom, which he viewed as the greatest obstacle to Russia's progress.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Sergei Iulevich Vitte (Witte), Count (1849–1915). Tsarist government official. Born into a family of mixed Dutch and Russian ancestry in government service, Witte studied mathematics at the University of Odessa, then entered the railway administration, in which he rose to responsible positions. In 1889, Witte was invited to establish a railway department in the Ministry of Finance and, in 1892, was named minister of finance. He developed far-reaching plans, combining both state direction and the nurturing of a "spirit of enterprise" for the economic development of the empire. At the heart of his plans was railway building, particularly the Trans-Siberian line. His relationship with the emperor, Nicholas II, was strained. In August 1903, Witte was removed from the Ministry of Finance and appointed to the then largely powerless position of chairman of the Council of Ministers. In July 1905, he was appointed chief Russian plenipotentiary to conduct peace negotiations with Japan. He used his influence in 1905, amidst the national general strike, to persuade the tsar to issue the "October Manifesto," which promised to grant a measure of representative government. He was forced to resign his post as chairman of the Council of Ministers in 1906 after the tsar lost confidence in him. In the summer and winter of 1914–1915, he opposed Russian entry into World War I. He died foreseeing disaster for the tsarist empire.

Vera Ivanovna Zasulich (1849–1919). Revolutionary. The daughter of a nobleman, educated to be a governess, Zasulich became a revolutionary in 1868, spending many of the succeeding years in prison, in hiding, or in exile. She was best known for shooting and wounding General Fedor Trepov, the governor of St. Petersburg, in punishment for his public flogging of a young revolutionary. She was acquitted by the jury in a much-publicized trial in 1878. She joined the populist group "Black Repartition" in 1879 and, along with many populists, was attracted to Marxism. She corresponded with Karl Marx and, later, Friedrich Engels. In 1884, she was a founding member of the first Russian Marxist organization, the émigré Liberation of Labor Group. She sided with the Menshevik faction when the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party split in 1903 and became a leader of those Marxists who favored legal political activities over underground tactics after 1908. She opposed the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917.

©2002 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

A History of Russia:
From Peter the Great to Gorbachev
Part III
Professor Mark D. Steinberg

THE TEACHING COMPANY ®

Mark D. Steinberg, Ph.D.

Professor of History, Director of the Russian and East European Center, University of Illinois

Mark Steinberg completed his undergraduate work at the University of California at Santa Cruz in 1978 and received his Ph.D. in European history at the University of California at Berkeley in 1987. He taught Russian and European history at the University of Oregon (1987), Harvard University (1987–1989), and Yale University (1989–1996) before joining the faculty at the University of Illinois, at its main campus in Urbana-Champaign, in 1996. Since 1998, Professor Steinberg has also been the Director of the Russian and East European Center at Illinois, an interdisciplinary program designated by the Department of Education as a national resource center.

Professor Steinberg has received many awards for his teaching, including the Sarai Ribicoff Prize for Teaching at Yale University (1993) and, at Illinois, the George and Gladys Queen Excellence in History Teaching Award (1998 and 2002) and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (2002). For his work as a scholar, he has received numerous prestigious fellowships, including from the International Research and Exchanges Board, the Social Science Research Council, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Smithsonian Institution, the Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In 2001, the University of Illinois gave him one of its highest honors and named him a University Scholar.

Professor Steinberg has published many articles, delivered numerous papers at national and international conferences, given public lectures throughout the country, and served on several national professional committees and editorial boards. He specializes in the cultural, intellectual, and social history of Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His first book, published in 1992, was a study of the relations among employers, managers, and workers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, entitled *Moral Communities*. In 1994, Professor Steinberg co-edited *Cultures in Flux*, an influential collection of essays on Russian lower-class cultures. In 1995, he published, together with a Russian archivist, *The Fall of the Romanovs*, which examines the fate of the tsar and his family during the revolution and includes translations of documents from then recently opened Russian archives. In 2001, Professor Steinberg published *Voices of Revolution, 1917*, a study and collection of translated documents exploring the revolution through contemporary letters and other writings by ordinary Russians. His most recent book, *Proletarian Imagination*, published in 2002, explores poetry and other writings by lower-class Russians in the years before and after 1917, focusing on ideas about self, modern times, and the sacred. He is currently working on a collection of essays on religion in Russia, a revised textbook on Russian history, and a study of St. Petersburg in the late 1800s and early 1900s.

Professor Steinberg is a native of San Francisco and is married to Jane Hedges, an editor and translator. Further information can be found at his Web site: http://www.history.uiuc.edu/steinb/index.htm.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Table of Contents

A History of Russia: From Peter the Great to Gorbachev Part III

Professor Biography i

Course Scope 1

Lecture Twenty-Five War and Revolution 2

Lecture Twenty-Six Democratic Russia—1917 5

Lecture Twenty-Seven Bolsheviks in Power 8

Lecture Twenty-Eight Civil War 10

Lecture Twenty-Nine Paths to Socialism—the 1920s 13

Lecture Thirty Joseph Stalin 16

Lecture Thirty-One Stalin's Revolution 18

Lecture Thirty-Two Joy and Terror—Society and Culture in the 1930s 21

Lecture Thirty-Three The "Great Patriotic War" 24

Lecture Thirty-Four The Soviet Union after Stalin 27

Lecture Thirty-Five Private and Public Dissidence 30

Lecture Thirty-Six Mikhail Gorbachev—*Perestroika* and *Glasnost'* 33

Bibliography 36

Please refer to Part I for the timeline and glossary and Part II for the biographical notes.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

A History of Russia: From Peter the Great to Gorbachev

Scope:

After a discussion of background issues (geography, multi-ethnicity, the problem of backwardness, Europeanization), the course begins with politics and culture on the eve of Peter the Great's efforts to transform his country, then looks at Peter and his reforms. Next, women's rule in eighteenth-century Russia is examined, with a particular focus on the reigns of Elizabeth (Peter the Great's daughter) and Catherine the Great. Turning toward society, two additional lectures on the eighteenth century follow: on the Pugachev uprising and the growing critique of autocratic despotism by educated Russians, especially the publisher and writer Nikolai Novikov. Lecture Seven begins the nineteenth century by returning to a focus on the state and the monarch: Paul I and especially Alexander I, who seriously discussed possible reform. We also look at the Decembrist rebellion, in which educated nobles took arms against the state to bring about social and political reform. Next, we consider Nicholas I and the ideas about power and order that inspired the Russian state at that time. Returning the gaze to society, the course then offers lectures on different intellectuals' visions of change: the "national poet" Alexander Pushkin (whom we consider also for what his image as a symbol of the Russian nation tells us) and the full-fledged emergence of the "intelligentsia" in the 1830s and 1840s. Particular attention is paid to their ideas about Russia, the West, and the meanings of freedom.

Lecture Thirteen begins the history of the Great Reforms under Alexander II, which sought to create a modern society in Russia though dramatic reform. We then examine dissident trends and the individuals associated with them: nihilism (including terrorism), populism, Marxism (including the emergence of Bolshevism). For a different voice, we look at the famous writer Lev Tolstoy, especially his life and his arguments about morality and conscience. Returning our gaze to official Russia, we highlight the lives, personalities, and outlooks of the last two tsars, Alexander III and his son Nicholas II. We then consider a decisive event in the reign of Nicholas: the strikes, demonstrations, and public demands that the tsarist government accept civil rights and democratic rule in Russia in 1905. To see Russia's changes in larger perspective, we look at peasant life and culture in the late 1800s and early 1900s, life in the changing cities (especially for workers and the middle class) from the industrialization drive of the 1890s to the eve of World War I, and at aspects of what might be called *fin-de-siècle* culture: decadence in everyday life and in the arts, cultural iconoclasm, and the religious renaissance.

Lecture Twenty-Five examines the Russian experience in World War I and the coming of revolution. It is followed with an examination of the Russian experience in the key months from the fall of the tsarist government in February to the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in October, then by a lecture on the Bolsheviks during their first year in power. The story of the Civil War comes next, followed by a discussion of the debates in the 1920s in the Soviet Union over how to overcome Russia's backwardness and build socialism. Next, we look at Joseph Stalin's biography and political personality, the era of radical industrialization and social transformation that he launched at the end of the 1920s, and the contradictory political, social, and cultural life of the 1930s (including the Great Terror). We turn then to the Soviet experience in World War II and to politics and the experiences of Soviet people during the decades after the war and before Gorbachev's reforms. Continuing the theme of exploring dissent, we look at some of the various forms of alienation from, and resistance to, the Soviet system during the years before Gorbachev came to power (both everyday forms and open dissidence). Finally, we look at Mikhail Gorbachev's recognition of the many problems of the system and his efforts to make Communism work though a policy of reform. The final lecture concludes with a consideration of the situation left in the wake of the collapse of Communism.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Five
War and Revolution

Scope: This lecture examines the Russian experience in World War I and the coming of revolution. It begins with the growing disenchantment with the war as a result of horrible conditions on the front, enormous human losses, and terrible economic conditions at home. Particular attention is paid to the situation of ordinary Russians, including their growing anger and protests. The lecture looks at unsuccessful efforts by liberals to convince the government to establish a cabinet that could command "the confidence of the public," but also their unwillingness to do more than appeal to the government to take action. The lecture concludes with the events of late February 1917, when strikes and demonstrations in the streets of the capital—centered on the symbolic demand for bread—led to the collapse of the monarchy and the coming to power of a liberal democratic government.

Outline

I. Russia had never experienced a war like World War I, a protracted modern war that required mobilizing the entire society and economy, as well as the military.

- **A.** Initially, the war was a positive event.
  - **1.** Going to war took people's minds off their problems.
  - **2.** Many people united in support of the government and against the external enemy.
- **B.** But this patriotic enthusiasm soon faded, and many people began to see the war as nothing less than a catastrophe.
- **C.** Conditions at the front led to growing discontent.
  - **1.** The supply situation was critical: The army quickly ran short of rifles and ammunition, uniforms and food.
  - **2.** The human losses were devastating.
  - **3.** Many soldiers justifiably felt that they were treated not as men but simply as raw material to be squandered by the powerful.
  - **4.** By the spring of 1915, the army was in steady (and often chaotic) retreat.
  - **5.** Although the military and supply situation improved in 1916, morale among the soldiers continued to decline.
- **D.** The situation at home was also difficult: By the end of 1915, the economy seemed to be breaking down under the strain of wartime demand.
  - **1.** Fuel and raw materials were increasingly scarce.
  - **2.** Productivity was declining.
  - **3.** The cities were suffering from food shortages.
  - **4.** Shortages were creating inflation.
  - **5.** These economic conditions produced increasing suffering, especially among the urban poor and middle classes.
  - **6.** Ironically and dangerously, suffering was particularly profound in the capital, Petrograd.
- **E.** The political decisions made by the tsar and his government exacerbated the situation.
  - **1.** Instead of involving citizens as active participants, Nicholas retreated even further into his personalized ideal of governance.
  - **2.** Reflecting this, in 1915, he took personal command of the army.
  - **3.** This associated him with Russia's lack of success at the front and gave his wife, Alexandra, and Rasputin greater day-to-day power in his absence.

II. The continuing carnage at the front, the heightened economic suffering in the rear, and the political rigidity of the tsar's government all led to intense civic protest.

- **A.** Among the urban lower classes, this discontent was expressed in a growing strike movement.
  - **1.** The main issues in the strikes were economic—wages and food.
  - **2.** But workers also made political demands, including calling for an end to the war.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. There were other signs of deepening discontent and anger among the urban poor.
  1. Speakers at factory meetings complained about economic conditions and the lack of a democratic government.
  2. On bread lines, working-class women grew angry standing for hours in the cold.
  3. Subversive leaflets and proclamations issued by all sorts of radical parties, unions, and committees found an increasingly eager readership.

C. Socialists worked to push this discontent in a political direction.

D. Educated upper-class and middle-class liberals also began to mobilize in protest.
  1. Liberals appealed to the autocracy to establish a unifying "government of national confidence."
  2. During the summer of 1915, a "Progressive Bloc" of Duma deputies formed to promote this idea.
  3. However, given his firm belief that Russia's salvation lay in the tsar's divine personal and unlimited power, Nicholas II rejected such suggestions and, instead, ordered the Duma prorogued in the fall of 1915.

E. Even many conservative monarchists, fearing revolution, appealed for political changes, though the murder of Rasputin was the only concrete effort made.

F. Liberals in the press and in the Duma (reconvened toward the end of 1916) criticized the government with increasing passion and even hostility.
  1. But they were afraid to do more than simply appeal to the tsar to make changes.
  2. They were strongly committed to principles of legality and feared provoking popular revolution in the streets.
  3. Some liberal Duma deputies chafed at the feeling of being trapped and powerless.
  4. Only when lower-class unrest broke out in the streets were liberals forced to take action.

III. This upheaval began on International Women's Day, February 23, 1917 (March 8 on the Western calendar).

A. In addition to the already large number of men and women on strike, thousands of women textile workers in Petrograd shut down their factories.
  1. The lack of bread had become the symbolic focus of protest and was the main focus of this strike.
  2. Crowds marched through the streets shouting, "Give us bread," and headed toward the city center.

B. By February 25 (March 10), Petrograd was virtually shut down.
  1. The demands had also expanded. In addition to "Bread," the banners read, "Down with the War" and "Down with the Autocracy."
  2. Soon, students, white-collar workers, teachers, and others joined workers in the streets.

C. Nicholas forced a showdown.
  1. Convinced that the people still fundamentally loved him, he commanded the head of the Petrograd garrison to stop the disorders in the capital.
  2. The garrison chief obeyed Nicholas's command and sent soldiers into the streets with orders to shoot at demonstrators.
  3. On the first day, the soldiers followed orders and shot at the crowds of demonstrators.
  4. However, on February 27 (March 12), with workers armed and ready for combat with troops, the soldiers mutinied and joined the crowds in the streets.

D. Effective civil authority collapsed, and the streets became a theater of revolutionary defiance.

E. The government quickly collapsed.
  1. The Cabinet resigned and fled on February 27.
  2. On March 2, Nicholas abdicated, hoping that this would end the disorder and bring unity to Russia.
  3. Formally, Nicholas abdicated in favor of his brother, who declined to accept the position.
  4. In essence, power, rather than being transferred, was dropped—the question of who would or could pick it up was central to the story of 1917.

Essential Reading:

W. Bruce Lincoln, *Passage through Armageddon: The Russians in War and Revolution, 1914–1918* (New York, 1986).

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (Harmondsworth, 1996), chapters 7–8.

Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917* (Seattle, 1981).

Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1990), chapters 6–8.

Allan Wildman, *The End of the Russian Imperial Army* (Princeton, 1980), volume 1.

Questions to Consider:

1. Could the revolution that toppled Romanov rule in February 1917 have been avoided? Might the government or liberals have acted any differently?
2. Did workers and liberals share common discontents and common goals in seeking a change of government?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Six
Democratic Russia—1917

Scope: This lecture looks at the Russian experience in the key months from the fall of the tsarist government in February to the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in October. It first examines the formation of the new Provisional Government, the competing power of the Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies, and the hesitations of both. To answer the question of why this liberal democratic government fell, the lecture considers both its accomplishments and its failures. Given that popular discontent and its reflection in growing Bolshevik popularity was a major threat to the government, the lecture looks next at the most common popular attitudes during the revolution. In particular, we explore four central ideas of the time: the love of freedom but also its social definition, the need for a strong and progressive state, distrust of and hostility toward the rich and powerful, and the centrality of moral feeling and ethical judgment.

Outline

I. The government of Nicholas II was replaced by a rather unusual system of hesitant and divided authority.

- **A.** Middle-class and upper-class liberals formed a Provisional Government.
- **B.** Although they controlled the machinery of government, their real authority was limited.
  - **1.** Some of these limitations were created by their own political reluctance and their sense of doubt about their legal legitimacy.
  - **2.** An external limitation on their authority came from the competing power of the Soviets ("Councils") of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies—especially the Petrograd Soviet and the Central Executive Committee of Soviets.
- **C.** "Dual power" was the term used to describe this coexistence of two competing structures of authority in the capital.
  - **1.** The Provisional Government controlled the state.
  - **2.** But the Soviets had real civic authority because they were considered the national representatives of the "people" (workers, peasants, soldiers) and could control their actions in the streets and factories and at the front.
- **D.** Leaders of the Soviets also resisted exercising their full authority because they did not believe that they should seek state power.
  - **1.** According to their ideological belief in the stages of history, this was a democratic, not a socialist, revolution.
  - **2.** They also believed that the time was not right for a socialist revolution in Russia.
- **E.** In the course of 1917, the situation deteriorated.
  - **1.** Opposition to the Provisional Government grew among workers, soldiers, and peasants.
  - **2.** By the fall of 1917, the Bolsheviks had succeeded in winning most of the seats in the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets.
  - **3.** On October 25, amidst a Bolshevik armed seizure of state power, the assembled national Congress of Soviets declared itself the new state authority.

II. The key question is why did the Provisional Government fall after less than eight months in power?

- **A.** This was a government deeply committed to democracy, and its accomplishments were impressive.
  - **1.** Complete civil liberties were granted.
  - **2.** Thousands of political prisoners and exiles were released, and the old police was abolished.
  - **3.** Flogging, exile to Siberia, and the death penalty were all abolished.
  - **4.** Legal restrictions of individual rights based on nationality or religion were removed.
  - **5.** Social reforms were enacted.
  - **6.** Preparations for creating a new democratic, constitutional political system were undertaken.
- **B.** But what they were unable to do was perhaps equally important.
  - **1.** They refused to withdraw unilaterally from the war.
  - **2.** They refused to sanction seizures of land by peasants.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. They were unable to improve the economic situation.

C. The Bolsheviks took advantage of these failures.
1. Lenin, who had returned to Russia in April 1917, believed that the party's goal must be to force the Soviets to take power.
2. Lenin believed that the time had come for a government representing workers and peasants.

III. Popular attitudes toward the revolution were a critical element in Bolshevik success.

A. The torrent of words that followed the fall of the autocracy is a valuable source for understanding popular attitudes.

B. For diverse social and political groups, the key meaning of this revolution was freedom.
1. For ordinary Russians, this was a mythic, even mystical, time of freedom.
2. In part, freedom involved the negation of repression and lack of rights.
3. But freedom was also viewed positively as an absolute value in itself.
4. Concrete and tangible benefits were also expected to accrue from freedom.

C. Power was another major theme in popular understanding of the revolution.
1. The dominant idea was the need for a strong and unified political authority.
2. Power was valued not for its own sake but for how it would be used and whom it would serve.
3. In part, the desire for strong authority reflected the practical desire to restore order to the country, to suppress crime, and to revive the collapsing economy.
4. But this was to be "democratic" power, power that would serve the interests of the poor against the rich.

D. Class was also a major theme in all these writings and discussions.
1. Most lower-class Russians distrusted the rich and powerful and blamed them for the revolution's failure to bring "bread, peace, land" and freedom.
2. For some people, the Bolsheviks or the Jews (or other outsiders) were the enemies and traitors.
3. But the primary enemy was always the "bourgeoisie."

E. Morality also pervaded popular attitudes during the revolution.
1. Moral feeling is visible in the emotional pathos and fervor in the language of the revolution.
2. Lower-class Russians persistently voiced their resentment at being humiliated and insulted by the elite.
3. We also see a widespread critique of the immorality of those in power.
4. The pervasive use of religious language also expressed this moral conception of the meaning of the revolution.

F. When the Bolsheviks came to power, they could draw support from popular attitudes—especially class hatred and a desire for a strong state serving their interests—but they also had to contend with popular conceptions of liberty and morality and a suspicion of all elites.

G. The writer Maksim Gor'kii insightfully described 1917 as "days of monstrous contradiction."

Essential Reading:

Mark Steinberg, *Voices of Revolution, 1917* (New Haven, 2001).

Supplementary Reading:

Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (Harmondsworth, 1996), chapters 8–11.

Donald H. Kaiser, ed., *The Workers Revolution in Russia, 1917* (Cambridge, England, 1987).

Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1990), chapters 8–11.

Alexander Rabinowitch, *The Bolsheviks Come to Power* (New York, 1976).

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. If the revolution was largely about freedom and democracy, how were these notions understood by lower-class Russians in 1917?
2. What might the Provisional Government or national Soviet have done, especially before Bolsheviks won majorities in Moscow and Petrograd Soviets, to prevent the Bolsheviks from gaining such popularity and successfully taking power in 1917?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Seven
Bolsheviks in Power

Scope: This lecture considers the actions and motivating ideas of the new Communist rulers of Russia, focusing on the first months of Soviet power. It begins by looking at the widespread doubt that Bolshevik rule could survive the many obstacles to success. To understand Bolshevik thinking about power, the lecture looks first at ideals of democratic emancipation and participation, especially as voiced by Lenin, and at specific emancipatory policies, including legislation on peace, land, workers' control, and nationalities. The lecture next considers the other side of Bolshevik thinking and policies: authoritarianism, repression, and violence. We look at Lenin's ideology and at particular policies: one-party rule, press censorship, the creation of the Cheka, economic and managerial centralization, and the disbanding of the Constituent Assembly. The lecture concludes with a look at the serious threats that faced Bolshevik power by mid-1918.

Outline

I. Few expected the Bolsheviks to remain in power very long, considering the challenges they confronted.

A. On October 26, having taken power in Petrograd by force of arms, the Bolsheviks proposed to the Soviet Congress a new cabinet composed entirely of Bolsheviks: the Council of People's Commissars.

1. After most other parties had walked out of the Congress to protest the Bolsheviks' seizure of power, the Congress approved the new government.

2. Vladimir Lenin, leader of the Bolshevik party, was elected head of the new government.

3. For this government to survive, however, it would have to do what it had promised: get Russia out of the war, restore the economy, and establish effective political rule.

B. Predictions of failure were widespread.

1. Most socialists argued that only a broad alliance of all revolutionary groups could hope to defend Soviet power against certain opposition from "the propertied classes."

2. Many predicted Bolshevik power would be only a brief stage in Russia's continued suffering.

C. The Bolsheviks themselves had two somewhat contradictory answers to these doubts.

1. The first was to view their actions as inspiring a worldwide socialist revolution that would bring help from the West.

2. The second was optimistic faith in the creative and heroic power of individuals to change history.

II. Nonetheless, Bolshevik leaders were rather unsure about how to rule the country.

A. Part of the problem was that the Bolsheviks were ambivalent about power itself.

1. The libertarian tradition in Bolshevism favored the ideals of popular creativity and power.

2. The authoritarian tradition in Bolshevism believed in the necessity of strong leadership and control, discipline and dictatorship, even coercive violence.

3. In some cases, different individuals held different views, but often these represented the two poles of a single individual's thought (including Lenin's).

B. On the one hand, Lenin envisioned governance as a "commune state" (on the model of the Paris Commune of 1871).

1. The revolution, he argued, had released the "energy, initiative, and decisiveness" of the people, who could now perform "miracles."

2. In the first weeks and months after October, Lenin regularly appealed to the people to realize these ideals.

C. Many of the government's first acts expressed these libertarian ideals.

1. The Decree on Peace (October 26) proclaimed a new approach to international affairs, free of secret diplomacy and grounded in the ideal of peace without indemnities or annexations.

2. The Decree on Land (October 26) abolished, without compensation, all landholding by the gentry and transferred all land to peasant land committees and soviets.

3. The workers' control decree of early November 1917 gave workers the right to supervise their own managers.

4. National minorities were told that they had the right to complete self-determination.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

5. All existing courts were replaced by courts in which judges were elected.
6. The administrative system was democratized by recruiting thousands of workers and soldiers into the bureaucracy and allowing extensive local control.

D. Some see this talk of democracy (and these early efforts) as insincere and even cynical.
1. At best, these were attempts to undermine the old order before asserting a new dictatorship.
2. At worst, these words and actions reflected Lenin's effort to hide his true authoritarian goals behind a democratic and libertarian fig leaf.
3. However, others argue that ideas of popular democracy and elite authoritarianism competed in the minds of Bolsheviks and that circumstances pushed authoritarianism to the fore.

E. Even before coming to power, Lenin did not hesitate to argue for the necessities of coercion and discipline.

F. After he came to power, this discourse grew increasingly common.

G. The early policies of the new government reflected these authoritarian convictions.
1. One of the first laws issued by the new government was a press law (October 27), which followed a decree closing most "bourgeois" papers and even some socialist papers.
2. On December 5, the Cheka (All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the Struggle against Counterrevolution and Sabotage) was established to control disorder, fight economic crime, and suppress opposition to Soviet power.
3. Many opponents of the regime were imprisoned, and some Bolshevik leaders, notably Lev Trotsky, warned that a greater terror against enemies was coming.
4. At the same time, vigorous moves were underway to centralize control of the still-declining economy and to increase labor discipline.
5. Unwilling to give up power, the Bolsheviks disbanded the long-awaited Constituent Assembly on January 5, 1918.

III. In these first few months, Bolshevik authority was still tenuous.

A. The economy was declining precipitously.

B. Disorder was pervasive.

C. Alternative parties on the left remained active and were increasingly critical of Bolshevik failures and betrayals.

D. In the spring of 1918, anti-Bolshevik armies began moving against the Soviet regime and the long-anticipated civil war began.

Essential Reading:

Mark Steinberg, *Voices of Revolution, 1917* (New Haven, 2001), part 3.

Supplementary Reading:

Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (Harmondsworth, 1996), chapter 11.

Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1990), chapter 12.

Robert Service, *Lenin: A Political Life* (Bloomington, 1991), volume 2, chapters 7–10.

Questions to Consider:

1. How can one reconcile the evidence for emancipatory, democratic, and even libertarian ideals in Bolshevism alongside Bolshevik authoritarianism in both word and deed?
2. Were the Bolsheviks, as their critics said, "destroyers of freedom"? Can one justify their efforts as necessary to create a viable order that could ensure the realization of the main demands of 1917: bread, peace, and land?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Eight
Civil War

Scope: The Civil War of 1918–1920 is the subject of this lecture. We look at the extent of political and military opposition to the new Communist government and trace the rising and declining fortunes of this opposition. To understand why the Bolsheviks won, the lecture examines the political divisions among the Whites, their military and material disadvantages, and their political handicaps, especially in the eyes of the country's peasant majority. The lecture considers the Red and White "terrors" and efforts to mobilize the population. Next, it looks at the impact of the Civil War on Bolshevik rule, especially increased centralization and a militarization of politics. But we also consider the persistence and intensification of Bolshevik emancipatory and utopian idealism. This discussion focuses, in particular, on efforts to transform everyday life and on visionary artistic projects of the Civil War years.

Outline

I. The Bolsheviks faced an impressive array of opponents in the Russian Civil War of 1918–1920.

A. The most well known of the Bolsheviks' opponents were the "White Armies," organized and led by former tsarist military officers and Cossacks.

1. The Volunteer Army was based in the south and led, at its height, by General Anton Denikin.

2. In Siberia, Admiral Aleksandr Kolchak formed an army in November 1918.

3. In the northwest, General Nikolai Iudenich established an army based in Estonia.

4. By the autumn 1919, a White victory seemed a real possibility.

B. The Bolsheviks also faced the organized opposition of parties on the Left.

1. Right Socialist Revolutionaries, some Mensheviks, and liberal Kadets established anti-Communist governments in various cities in the late spring.

2. Even the Left Socialist Revolutionaries had attempted an uprising against the Bolsheviks in the spring of 1918.

C. In the south and southeast, local Cossacks established anti-Communist (though not always pro-White) governments.

1. In the borderlands, independence movements removed large parts of the former empire.

2. A large part of the western territory was occupied by German troops as part of the March 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that took Soviet Russia out of the war.

3. More than a dozen nations sent troops and money to oppose the Bolsheviks.

D. Despite these many opponents and challenges, the Bolsheviks won the Civil War.

II. The crucial question is how did they manage to win?

A. One of the reasons that the Communists survived was that their opponents failed to form a coordinated and united opposition.

1. The opposition was politically divided, ranging from moderate socialists to extreme monarchists.

2. They were also militarily divided, lacking a central command structure comparable to the Red Army commanded by Lev Trotsky.

B. The Communists also had logistical advantages.

1. The Whites were scattered around the peripheries.

2. The Soviet government controlled the Russian heartlands, which gave them control of the railroad.

C. The Soviet government was also more effective than the Whites in mobilizing the resources needed to wage war.

1. Soon after the Civil War began, the government nationalized all industry.

2. Strict labor discipline and even forced labor were instituted.

3. Through a policy of forced requisitioning of grain, the government ensured adequate food supplies for the army and the industrial labor force.

D. In the areas they ruled or won control over, the Communists also restored political order.

1. They established a functioning state apparatus.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. They used ruthless tactics to control dissent and stifle opposition, including launching a "Red Terror."

E. This brutality might have worked against the Communists, but the Whites were scarcely less ruthless.
1. The Whites also requisitioned grain by force (though less systematically).
2. The Whites also used terror and even torture against their enemies.

F. Ultimately, it is most often argued that the Communists won because they had more support among the majority of the population.
1. In part, the Bolsheviks did a better job of getting their message across, of communicating what Bolshevik power represented.
2. But more important than the medium of Bolshevik propaganda was the message: A White victory would mean the return of the capitalists and the landlords.
3. The Whites themselves helped to reinforce this Bolshevik message. The leaders of the White armies were former tsarist officers and large landowners, and the Whites sometimes returned expropriated land to its former owners.

III. Although the Bolsheviks survived this cataclysm and retained their hold on power, Bolshevism was profoundly changed by the experience of the Civil War.

A. The Civil War encouraged greater centralization and authoritarianism.
1. Rather than the ideal of an "armed working class" fighting a guerilla war, the Red Army was a traditional standing army of peasant draftees in which democratic models of command were set aside.
2. To effectively mobilize the population and the economy for the war, the state became increasingly centralized.

B. The experiences of the Civil War led to what has been called a "militarization" of Bolshevik political culture.
1. Bolsheviks grew accustomed to an essentially military style of rule.
2. Ruling by administrative fiat, using force and violence, and applying summary justice became normal methods of governance.

IV. The idealistic, emancipatory, and utopian side of Bolshevism was also intensified by the Civil War.

A. Radical attempts were made to transform personal life, especially relations between men and women.
1. Laws were enacted that mandated complete equal rights for women.
2. A special branch of the party (*Zhenotdel*) was formed to encourage women to act more independently.
3. Some Communists even took the first steps toward the Communist ideal of abolishing the family.

B. Campaigns were also launched to transform everyday cultural life, especially among the lower classes.
1. Campaigns against religious beliefs sought especially to "demystify" religion.
2. A massive literacy campaign was inaugurated.
3. Campaigns against swearing, drinking, and fighting were undertaken.
4. Campaigns to persuade peasants to adopt more civilized habits were launched.

C. Radical artistic visions of a new and better world also appeared during the period of the Civil War.
1. Exemplary are two visionary, and never built, public monuments.
2. The first was a large architectural and sculptural ensemble proposed in September 1918 by Ivan Shadr—a "Monument to the World's Suffering"—which would lead visitors on a symbolic journey from suffering to redemption.
3. In 1919, Vladimir Tatlin was authorized to construct a "Monument to the Third International," which was meant to symbolize and serve the modernist idealism of Communism.

Essential Reading:

Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (Harmondsworth, 1996), chapters 12–16.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Supplementary Reading:

Diane Koenker, William Rosenberg, and Ronald Suny, eds., *Party, State, and Society in the Russian Civil War* (Bloomington, 1989).

Evan Mawdsley, *The Russian Civil War* (Boston, 1987).

Lewis Siegelbaum, *Soviet State and Society between Revolutions, 1918–1929* (Cambridge, England, 1992).

Questions to Consider:

1. What might the opponents of Bolshevism have done differently to win the Civil War? Why did they not do these things?
2. What are the ideological ideals implied by such projects as Shadr's "Monument to the World's Suffering" and Tatlin's "Monument to the Third International"?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Twenty-Nine
Paths to Socialism—the 1920s

Scope: This lecture focuses on the debates in the 1920s in the Soviet Union about how to overcome Russia's backwardness and build socialism. It first considers the economic and political crisis and the end of the Civil War and the creation of the New Economic Policy (NEP). The positive effects of NEP on the economy are considered, as well as the continuation of troubling social conditions. The lecture then turns to the debates in the Communist leadership, focusing on the arguments of the leaders of the Left and Right, Lev Trotsky and Nikolai Bukharin. Trotsky's arguments about the essential need to overcome Russian backwardness through the aggressive efforts of the party and the state are examined, as are his political criticisms of the bureacraticization of the party. The lecture then considers Bukharin's critique of these proposals, focusing on both his economic logic and his ethical concerns. The lecture concludes by looking again at NEP society, especially continuing expressions of revolutionary idealism.

Outline

I. The end of the Civil War was a time of crisis and decision for the Bolsheviks.
- **A.** The economy had virtually collapsed: Famine was widespread and growing, and trade and industry were nearly at a standstill.
- **B.** Peasants and workers began to express their frustrations and anger over economic conditions, as well as Bolshevik authoritarianism.
  - **1.** Much of the country saw the outbreak of massive peasant rebellions.
  - **2.** Among urban workers, 1920–1921 was a time of protest meetings, demonstrations, and strikes.
- **C.** A rebellion also took place at the Kronstadt naval base, once a center of Bolshevik radicalism.
- **D.** Various dissident factions formed within the Communist Party.

II. These conditions forced the party to change course or, as it seemed to some, to retreat.
- **A.** At the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921, Lenin proposed a compromise strategy combining repression and reform.
  - **1.** Repression was still needed to protect Communist power.
  - **2.** But reform, known as the New Economic Policy (NEP), was also needed to appease popular discontent.
- **B.** These changes had a dramatic impact on the economy, and by 1926, the economy had largely reached its prewar level.
- **C.** Problems persisted, however.
  - **1.** The amount of capital available was inadequate to expand the economy beyond prewar levels; thus, it was not possible to overcome backwardness and poverty.
  - **2.** Workers were still a subordinate class.
  - **3.** Living conditions in the cities were terrible.
  - **4.** Crime was rampant.
  - **5.** Much of the old bourgeois culture had returned: expensive restaurants, cafes, casinos, and nightclubs.
- **D.** One of the most serious problems was the feeling that NEP represented a betrayal of the revolution and should soon be ended.
- **E.** These conditions and concerns generated significant debates in the 1920s.

III. A key figure in these debates was Lev Trotsky (1879–1940).
- **A.** Trotsky had joined the party only in mid-1917, but as a convert to Bolshevism, he was (in the terminology of the time) the hardest of the hard.
- **B.** During the Civil War, as commander of the Red Army, he was a leading advocate of the use of force, coercion, even terror.
  - **1.** Trotsky offered a utilitarian argument in defense of terror: In times of revolution and civil war, whatever means are expedient are just.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. Trotsky also argued that the ends not only justify the means but ennoble them and make them moral.

C. Two other key beliefs also influenced the arguments he would advance in the 1920s.
1. Russia's abysmal economic and cultural backwardness was a major obstacle to building socialism.
2. Like Lenin, Trotsky believed in the necessity, under conditions of backwardness, of the vanguard (the state and the party).

D. Trotsky, along with other Bolsheviks, known as the Left, articulated an extensive critique of the NEP.
1. Industrialization must be given high priority if Russia was to overcome its backwardness.
2. Long-term and extensive economic planning was necessary, as was capital for investment (which had to be accumulated by the state).
3. To accomplish these goals, the state needed to direct and control an activist and intrusive economic policy that would squeeze the private sector.

E. Trotsky also criticized the party's authoritarianism and bureaucratization.
1. He criticized the appointment of provincial party secretaries, who became virtual local dictators.
2. He called for wider mass initiative and participation in party affairs.
3. He called for freedom of expression and independent thought.

IV. Within the party leadership, Trotsky's chief intellectual opponent was Nikolai Bukharin (1888–1938).

A. As a person, Bukharin was quite different from Trotsky: more personable and better liked, less oriented to the military style.

B. Bukharin opposed Trotsky and those allied with him on the Left because he disagreed with their economic program.
1. Bukharin agreed that Russia's backwardness was the most serious obstacle to building socialism in Russia.
2. But he feared that planning and forced accumulation and development would only impede growth.
3. Bukharin favored a more gradual industrialization plan based on consumption and the market, rather than on forced accumulation and production.

C. Like Lenin, Bukharin saw the essential political need to ensure that the peasants tolerated Bolshevism.
1. Peasants needed to be taught about socialism, persuaded and converted.
2. He feared that the Left's program would alienate the peasants and lead to civil conflict and rebellion.

D. The road to socialism was, for Bukharin, necessarily gradual and evolutionary, peaceful and bloodless, not the road of class struggle and coercion.

E. Thus, Bukharin's attacks on the Left also contained an ethical element.
1. Capitalism, though historically progressive, was cruel and brutal.
2. Socialism would be different.

F. The party intensely debated these questions throughout the 1920s.
1. Trotsky and the Left were defeated and removed from the party leadership.
2. Then Stalin turned against Bukharin and his supporters on the party Right.

V. It is important to look briefly at life outside the party at this time.

A. Soviet society in the 1920s was partly a continuation of old Russian life, including business and pleasure, crime and corruption, poverty and progress.

B. But revolutionary idealism persisted, and many experiments in transforming everyday life were undertaken.
1. Young people organized communes.
2. Individual women insisted on their rights to complete personal freedom.
3. Symbolic of the new spirit of collectivism and lack of authoritarianism were such experiments as the Orchestra without a Conductor.
4. The "Down with Shame Movement" believed that the only really egalitarian and truly free apparel was no apparel at all and that "shame" at nakedness reflected philistine cultural values.

C. For many Russians, the diversity of the Soviet experience in the 1920s made them look back on NEP as a golden age.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Essential Reading:

Stephen F. Cohen, *Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution* (Oxford, 1980).

Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921–1929* (any edition).

Supplementary Reading:

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *The Cultural Front: Power and Culture in Revolutionary Russia* (Ithaca, 1992).

Sheila Fitzpatrick, Alexander Rabinowitch, and Richard Stites, eds., *Russia in the Era of NEP* (Bloomington, 1991).

Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (Oxford, 1985).

Ronald G. Suny, *The Structure of Russian History: Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 2003), part II.

Questions to Consider:

1. Which plan, Trotsky's or Bukharin's, would seem most likely to have been able, if given the chance, to overcome Russian economic backwardness and create a viable and more just society?
2. Many ordinary Russians who believed in the promises of the revolution felt that NEP policies and social conditions were leading the country in the wrong direction. What troubled them about NEP and the society it enabled?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty
Joseph Stalin

Scope: This lecture looks at Stalin's biography and political personality. It begins with what we know of Stalin's personality and values as a young man, especially his rebellious spirit, his ideal of heroism, and his sacralization of principles. The lecture also examines his attraction to the Bolsheviks and his approach to Bolshevik ideology, notably his ideas about will and positive faith. Next, Stalin's rise to power is considered, especially in relationship to the increasingly centralized structure of the Communist party, Stalin's place in the party apparatus, and changes in membership. To fully understand Stalin's success, the lecture also considers discontent with the policies of NEP.

Outline

I. We must begin with the youthful personality, ideas, and values of the man who most dominated Soviet life from the late 1920s to his death in 1953: Joseph Stalin (born Iosif Dzhugashvili in 1879).

- **A.** Everyone who knew Stalin as a boy spoke of traits that have been described as that of an angry "rebel personality."
  - **1.** He tended to rebel against every manifestation of authority over him, notably at the seminary where he studied.
  - **2.** Soon, he extended the petty defiances of a schoolboy into political defiance: He joined an underground Social Democratic Party circle (for which he was expelled from the seminary).
- **B.** Complicating this, he was known to be insecure and defensive.
- **C.** The seminary may have encouraged certain features of his personal political culture.
  - **1.** He seems to have imbibed a taste for dogma and for the sacredness of principles.
  - **2.** The seminary may also have encouraged his Manichean vision of the world.
- **D.** Another noticeable trait in Stalin's youth was an obsession with heroes and heroism.
  - **1.** Throughout his life, he had special heroes—and did everything he could to emulate them.
  - **2.** Reflecting this, when still in elementary school, he took the nickname Koba after a Robin Hood-like hero in a favorite book; later, he changed to the revolutionary underground name Stalin ("Man of Steel").

II. Stalin's political biography reflected many of these traits and self-ideals.

- **A.** At a time when most Georgian socialists were Mensheviks, Stalin chose the Bolsheviks.
  - **1.** He was impressed by Lenin's heroic idea of the vanguard party of professional revolutionaries.
  - **2.** He was attracted by the Bolshevik reputation for toughness and greater militancy.
  - **3.** For Stalin, all these traits were embodied in the ideas and personality of the Bolshevik leader, Lenin, whom Stalin liked to call the "mountain eagle" of the party.
- **B.** In the great debates over policy in the 1920s—which were also struggles over power—Stalin generally supported the dominant pro-NEP view, but in speeches and writings, he indicated that this was not his basic philosophical approach.
  - **1.** He placed great stress on the importance and power of human will, on the "subjective" in history.
  - **2.** He argued that Leninism was a style of leadership entailing the combination of "Russian revolutionary sweep" with "American practicality."
  - **3.** When Stalin criticized Trotsky in the 1920s, he accused him of lacking sufficient optimism and faith.
  - **4.** Similarly, in 1928–1929, Stalin and his supporters criticized the pro-NEP arguments of Bukharin and others of the "Right deviation" for their "pessimism."
  - **5.** There was also what some have called a religious spirit to Stalin's ideas—a preoccupation with faith and the dogmatic sacrality of certain ideas.

III. We must consider how Stalin acquired so much influence and power in the 1920s.

- **A.** Perhaps the most important factor was the changing structure of the party and Stalin's place in this apparatus.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

B. During the Civil War, the whole structure of the party was reorganized.
  1. Until then, the party was governed by a small Central Committee dominated by Lenin.
  2. In 1919, a more complex structure was created, including a Political Bureau (Politburo), an Organizational Bureau (Orgburo), and a Secretariat.
  3. The role of the Secretariat—which Stalin headed after 1922—grew increasingly important, having control of party membership, appointments, and assignments.

C. In Stalin's hands, these powers proved to be tools for strengthening his own influence.
  1. He could fill the party bureaucracy with supporters and loyalists.
  2. He could appoint the powerful party secretaries.
  3. Through the secretaries, he could also influence selection of delegates to the Party Congress, which was the supreme power in the party.
  4. This can be described as a "circular flow of power," with Stalin holding the key levers.

D. There were a number of reasons why the rank and file of the party was not more assertive of their formal rights to elect officials and delegates, but the most important may have been the changing composition of the party.
  1. During the Civil War there was an enormous increase in party membership, especially as Communist victory became more likely.
  2. This had a major impact on political attitudes and behavior.
  3. Above all, these new Communists, now a majority, were less independent-minded and more obedient to the party organization.
  4. This was intensified in 1924, at the time of Lenin's death, with the massive "Lenin enrollment" promoted by Stalin.

E. As General Secretary, Stalin could make use of these conditions.
  1. He built networks of supporters in both party and state.
  2. This administrative power played a critical role in Stalin's defeat of the party oppositions in the 1920s.

IV. Once Stalin succeeded in becoming the dominant leader in the party at the very end of the 1920s, he made his heroic and willful political-cultural style central to the spirit of the times.

A. Given his personality and style, it is not surprising that he felt uncomfortable with Bukharin's moderate arguments about economic and social development.

B. But Stalin also spoke to the dissatisfactions and desires of many.
  1. There were troubling economic problems with NEP.
  2. Internationally, there was a growing fear of a coming war against the USSR, for which the country was not prepared.
  3. Most important, there was considerable hostility to NEP.

C. The main policy expression of Stalin's approach was a massive program of industrial and social transformation, embodied in the First Five-Year Plan.
  1. A good expression of the spirit motivating this drive to transform Russia was the statement in 1927 by Stalin's chief economist Strumilin: "There are no fortresses that Bolsheviks cannot storm."
  2. In many ways, this phrase captured the essence of the emerging Stalinist political culture.

Essential Reading:

Robert Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879–1929* (New York, 1973).

Supplementary Reading:

Lewis Siegelbaum, *Soviet State and Society between Revolutions, 1918–1929* (Cambridge, England, 1992).

Questions to Consider:

1. How would you characterize Stalin's political outlook in comparison to Trotsky's and Bukharin's?

2. In what way was Stalin's party nickname, which meant "Man of Steel," revealing about his political personality and values?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-One
Stalin's Revolution

Scope: This lecture covers the era of radical industrialization and social transformation of the First Five-Year Plan (1928–1932). It considers why Stalin led the country on this sudden change of course in abandonment of NEP. Looking at the industrialization drive, the lecture examines the military atmosphere of the campaign, the politicization of economics, and the effects of this industrial upheaval. Next, forced collectivization of the peasantry is examined—the course of the campaign, peasant responses, and its effects. Finally, the lecture looks at the time of social radicalism known as the "cultural revolution." We consider class and generational conflict in the professions, as well as plans by professionals to remake human society and even the individual.

Outline

I. In 1928, Stalin distanced himself from his ally Bukharin and the market-based ideas of NEP.

- **A.** Bukharin offered the most cynical interpretation of this shift: Stalin is an "unprincipled intriguer" who changes his theories according to whom he wishes to get rid of.
- **B.** A variant was that Stalin had always favored a more aggressive industrialization strategy than Bukharin but had kept these views in the background in order to defeat Trotsky and the Left.
- **C.** It is also possible, however, that Stalin's thinking gradually evolved in response to economic, social, and political pressures in the late 1920s.

II. Stalin's policy began to resemble a new revolution, or a new civil war.

- **A.** This new militancy was apparent, for example, in the announced drafts of the First Five-Year Plan for 1928–1932.
  - **1.** While this plan was being drafted, there were strong political pressures to be more ambitious.
  - **2.** The final draft set almost mythical targets.
  - **3.** From the point of view of enthusiasts of this industrial revolution from above, including Stalin, this plan was not ambitious enough.
  - **4.** One may argue that the First Five-Year Plan was less an economic plan than a political manifesto meant to inspire.
- **B.** The whole atmosphere of the First Five-Year Plan reflected this politicization, which meant militarization, of economics.
  - **1.** The press described industry as a battlefield.
  - **2.** To achieve or overfulfill goals, "shock troops" of workers were rushed to production sites.
  - **3.** Young people volunteered to work on such grandiose projects as the Magnitogorsk metallurgical factories in the Urals.
  - **4.** Those who urged that more rational policies be adopted, or who failed in their tasks, were treated like traitors in wartime.
- **C.** These efforts produced mixed and unbalanced economic results.
  - **1.** Heavy industry developed at the expense of consumer goods.
  - **2.** Even heavy industry suffered from an imbalance of growth.
  - **3.** But production did increase considerably.
  - **4.** These efforts also helped lay a foundation for more moderate but sustained growth during the following Five-Year Plans.

III. The changes in agriculture were even greater.

- **A.** Agrarian development was also treated as a political, even military, campaign.
- **B.** From 1927 to 1930, the attack on the peasantry gradually intensified.
  - **1.** In the winter of 1927–1928, grain requisitioning was reinstated.
  - **2.** Peasants responded by sowing less land.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

3. In response, the campaign was intensified; *kulaks* (richer peasants) were to be "liquidated as a class," and collectivization of all agriculture was decreed in 1930.

C. The result of these decrees was intense and violent.
1. Hundreds of thousands of *kulaks* were evicted from their homes and their property was confiscated.
2. More than half of all remaining peasants were forced into collective farms.
3. Almost all property was collectivized.

D. Peasants resisted these measures in different ways.
1. Some peasants resisted actively.
2. Most peasants, though, engaged in more passive resistance: abandoning the countryside or, if remaining, slaughtering vast numbers of their animals.

E. The results of collectivization were also mixed.
1. Grain procurements had increased and peasants were now under the political control of the state.
2. But agriculture suffered as sullen peasants refused to exert themselves.
3. The most serious consequence of collectivization was its toll in human lives.

IV. When recounting these years, it can be difficult to recall that this was also a time of heroic idealism.

A. One sign of this was the widespread idea that the First Five-Year Plan was also a "cultural revolution."

B. One aspect of this revolution was "social purging."
1. Beginning in 1928, "bourgeois experts" (especially engineers) were publicly tried.
2. Communists were encouraged to challenge the role of non-proletarian experts throughout Soviet society in almost every profession and every institution.
3. Although initiated and manipulated from above, this cultural revolution had great public appeal and spontaneity.
4. Elements of class and generational conflict were clearly visible in these struggles.

C. The cultural revolution was also about ideas, especially about how to transform everyday life.

D. In education, Shulgin proposed replacing formal schooling with a proletarian education that would involve school communes and extensive participation in productive labor.

E. City planners also offered transformative plans.
1. For example, various proposals were made for a new type of city.
2. Many of these plans combined a radical modernist love of technology with a desire to eliminate the traditional city and even the state.
3. A good example of these ideas was the vision of the sociologist Okhitovich and the architects Sokolov and Ginzburg, who envisioned a world without any permanent settlements at all and people living in one-person cells.
4. Many of these visionaries also sought to create environments that would liberate the inner person.

F. The years of Stalin's revolution were contradictory times.
1. Centralized control, tyrannical state power, brutality, even murderous violence were commonplace.
2. Yet idealism, enthusiasm, dreams of a new world, and often fantastic optimism were also present.
3. No wonder, then, that historians have fiercely debated the meaning of these years.

Essential Reading:

Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley, 1995).

Supplementary Reading:

R. W. Davies, *The Industrialization of Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, 1979), 2 volumes.

———, *The Socialist Offensive: The Collectivization of Soviet Agriculture*, *1929–30* (Cambridge, 1980).

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928–1931* (Bloomington, 1978).

Moshe Lewin, *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power*: *A Study of Collectivization* (New York, 1968).

Ronald G. Suny, *The Structure of Russian History: Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 2003), chapter 4.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. In interpreting the era of the First Five-Year Plan, how would you balance the mixture of brutality and idealism and explain their interrelationship?
2. Why were peasants forced into collective farms in 1930? For economic reasons? For political reasons?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-Two

Joy and Terror—Society and Culture in the 1930s

Scope: This lecture looks at political, social, and cultural life during the years of high Stalinism. Framed by the controversial argument over whether the Stalinist 1930s were a period of totalitarianism and victimhood or of popular support and happiness, the lecture looks at contradictory trends in the 1930s. First, we examine Stalinist authoritarianism: censorship, cultural uniformity and conservatism, the cult of Stalin, and constant mobilization against enemies. Next, the lecture looks at the violent state terror of the late 1930s, including the famous show trials and the devastation of the party, but also the pervasiveness of the terror throughout Soviet society. Next, the lecture considers the many manifestations of the ideal captured in the slogan of 1936, "Life has become more joyful." We look at the cult of prosperity and happiness and at its reflections in everyday life, including material life, leisure culture, popular music, and film.

Outline

I. The Stalinist 1930s may well be the most enigmatic period in Soviet history, and the era has generated fierce debates among scholars.

- **A.** Some have insisted on the totalitarian character of these years, focusing on indoctrination, terror, and victimization.
- **B.** Others have emphasized social support for the system and its responsiveness.

II. It is clear that the 1930s was a time of overwhelming authoritarian power.

- **A.** A cultural "iron curtain" surrounded the country.
  - **1.** Travel abroad was almost impossible.
  - **2.** Censorship was strict.
- **B.** Russian culture was made more uniform than ever before in Russian history.
  - **1.** The relative freedom and diversity in art and literature in the 1920s was ended.
  - **2.** This orthodoxy was in many ways quite conservative.
- **C.** Experimentation in everyday social and cultural life was also discouraged.
  - **1.** The family policies of the 1920s were reversed.
  - **2.** The social radicalism of the First Five-Year Plan was abandoned, with attacks on experts halted, income inequality allowed to grow, and status and rank reinforced by privilege.
  - **3.** Education reverted to traditional forms.
- **D.** Another sign of this totalitarian culture of power was the cult of the leader.
  - **1.** Everywhere, one saw huge pictures of Stalin and Lenin, and they were constantly quoted.
  - **2.** Huge ceremonies were staged in which citizens expressed love for Stalin.
- **E.** The 1930s was also a time of constant mobilization as if for war against various internal and external enemies.

III. At its most extreme, the 1930s witnessed violent repression on a wide scale.

- **A.** The face of the "terror" best known to the world was the series of show trials of prominent Communists (from August 1936–March 1938).
  - **1.** In these trials, leading "Old Bolsheviks" were accused of, and forced to confess to, implausible political crimes.
  - **2.** Most of the victims of these trials, though high-ranking Communists, were executed.
- **B.** Among the rank and file of the party, a frenzy of public denunciations paralleled the show trials.
  - **1.** Constant meetings were held at which party members were expected to denounce enemies of the regime.
  - **2.** Those caught up in this sweep of denunciations would be thrown out of the party, imprisoned, sent to labor camps, or perhaps, shot.
- **C.** Not only party members suffered.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. Large numbers of officials, military officers, engineers, scientists, and others were arrested and sent to the camps (the Gulag).
2. Many other groups were specially victimized, ranging from non-Russian nationalities to foreign communists who fled Hitler and Mussolini.
3. Even children were expected to denounce their parents for criticisms of the regime.

D. The full scope of the "Great Terror" is difficult to measure.
1. Communists suffered the worst, especially the party's top ranks, which were decimated.
2. Other institutions were also targeted, notably the officer corps of the Red Army.
3. The total numbers who suffered, of course, are unknown, but likely included several million under arrest and perhaps millions killed.

IV. Also part of the story of the 1930s was the spirit of public pleasure and joy.

A. In 1936, Stalin captured this spirit in a new guiding slogan: "Life has become more joyful."

B. This spirit was expressed publicly in many ways throughout the thirties.
1. We see this in the ways Stalin himself began to be portrayed.
2. We see it in pervasive images of prosperity and happiness.

C. This was more than an image: There was a growing practical emphasis on the material rewards of hard work and loyalty.

D. The Stakhanovist movement is a good illustration.
1. At first glance, Stakhnovism would seem to represent the totalitarian mobilization of society for production.
2. But by the mid-1930s, the focus was increasingly on the personal and material rewards of devoted labor.
3. The press made a point of describing Stakhanovites acquiring goods and spending leisure time with their happy families.

E. Another major expression of this official mood of happiness and optimism was popular entertainment.
1. In Moscow, Gorky Park became a fantasy escape park.
2. The 1930s also marked the time of a great jazz revival, with public concerts widespread.
3. Most city parks sponsored nighttime dances in the summer.
4. Soviet life was pervaded with light or romantic popular songs.
5. Cinema also tended to emphasize not only ideology but adventure, romance, and fun.

F. Even architecture tried to express the idea that "Life has become more joyful."
1. This was a time of constant construction (especially in Moscow) for the government and the elite.
2. In addition, public spaces were created to foster the feeling that the state cared for people. The famous Moscow metro was typical.

G. Meanwhile, most Muscovites lived in crowded "communal apartments."

H. How is one to interpret this emphasis on "joy" even amidst "terror"?
1. Some argue that this was a concession to popular tastes and desires.
2. Others argue that both joy and terror were parts of the way the system controlled people.
3. Still others suggest a relationship that was more complex and contradictory.

Essential Reading:

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism* (Oxford, 1999).

Supplementary Reading:

Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (Oxford, 1991).

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Stalin's Peasants: Resistance and Survival in the Russian Village after Collectivization* (Oxford, 1994).

J. Arch Getty and Roberta Manning, eds., *Stalinist Terror* (Cambridge, England, 1993).

Lewis Siegelbaum and Andrei Sokolov, eds., *Stalinism as a Way of Life* (New Haven, 2000).

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. How do you interpret the seemingly contradictory faces of Stalinist political culture in the 1930s, that is, conservatism, ideological mobilization, terror, and a culture of happiness? Can these be reconciled as part of a consistent political strategy?
2. Why was the radical experimentalism of the first decade of the revolution, and even of the Stalinist revolution, rejected after 1931?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-Three
The "Great Patriotic War"

Scope: This lecture examines the Soviet experience in World War II. It begins with Soviet expectations and fears of war that preceded the Nazi attack, efforts to delay its coming, and unpreparedness when it did come in 1941. Next, the lecture examines the course of the war itself and key battles, especially at Stalingrad. Asking how the Soviet Union survived and helped to win the war, the lecture explores the military and economic conditions aiding Soviet victory and, above all, popular mobilization in support of the war against Germany. We consider the main values around which resistance coalesced, especially defense of nation and home, and how Nazi ideology and practices contributed to their defeat in Russia. Finally, the lecture analyzes the consequences of the war experience for postwar society and politics.

Outline

I. Although the USSR had long anticipated war, when it came on June 22, 1941, the country was shockingly unprepared.

- **A.** Since 1917, Soviet leaders had been constantly predicting a great confrontation between the socialist and the capitalist worlds.
  - **1.** This seemed especially likely in the 1930s with the rise of fascism, seen as extreme capitalism.
  - **2.** From 1934–1938, Soviet diplomacy sought "collective security" to contain German expansion.
  - **3.** When this failed, the Soviet Union made a deal with Germany (the 1939 Non-Aggression Pact) to give it a buffer of space and time.
- **B.** When Nazi Germany invaded the USSR two years later, the Soviet leadership (and the army and economy) was shockingly unprepared.
  - **1.** The Soviet Union suffered great losses of airplanes, tanks, and soldiers in the first days of the war.
  - **2.** By late November 1941, the German armies had reached the outskirts of Moscow, surrounded Leningrad, and taken most of Ukraine.
- **C.** There are many explanations for why Russia was so unprepared.
  - **1.** The official Soviet explanation was German perfidiousness and surprise.
  - **2.** One problem was the quality of the army, especially its leadership, because of both purges and poor equipment.
  - **3.** More subtly, the political culture of Stalinism had effects on Soviet preparedness in the military, discouraging officers on the frontier from acting without orders.
  - **4.** A major factor was Stalin, especially his conviction that his pact with Germany would effectively protect the USSR.
  - **5.** Stalin had even been warned about the planned German invasion, but he distrusted these reports.
- **D.** Hitler made his own miscalculations in invading Russia.
  - **1.** He expected a short war, certainly over before the notorious Russian winter.
  - **2.** Instead, the war was protracted, with a long front, overextended supply lines, and worsening weather.

II. As the war dragged on, Russia was able to recover from the defeats of 1941.

- **A.** In the summer of 1942, the Germans launched a second offensive.
  - **1.** They focused on the south in order to seize the valuable oil fields of the Caucasus.
  - **2.** Once again, the Red Army suffered serious losses, but German success was not complete.
- **B.** The crucial battle in this campaign came at Stalingrad in the fall and winter of 1942.
  - **1.** Both Hitler and Stalin considered the city of great symbolic importance.
  - **2.** The Germans took the city against enormous resistance.
  - **3.** A Red Army counteroffensive cut off the German army's overstretched supply lines and prevailed.
  - **4.** This was a turning point in the war—not only for Russia, but, many argue, for the entire Allied cause.

III. How did the Soviet Union survive and even contribute to winning the war?

- **A.** One factor was the improved quality of military command in the Red Army.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. After the initial defeats, Stalin was willing to fire incompetent commanders, even when they were personal friends, and appoint competent commanders, such as Georgii Zhukov.
2. Stalin also let the military experts make the major military decisions.

B. No less important were the economic resources that the army had at its disposal.
1. By 1943, the Red Army was supplied with sufficient quantities of weapons, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes.
2. The quality of its equipment was sometimes superior to that of Germany.

C. This was partly attributable to lend-lease aid from Britain and the United States, but mostly to Russia's own resources, enabled by earlier industrialization and centralized control of the economy.

IV. No less important was the mobilization of human resources, the methods of which reveal much about the deeper meanings of the war for Soviet society.

A. Official propaganda was full of tales of heroism, courage, and sacrifice, but these were also quite real. This can be seen in:
1. The high morale and willingness to fight of Red Army soldiers;
2. The efforts of partisans;
3. The impressive solidarity of non-combatants in such situations as the siege of Leningrad.

B. The country had never in Soviet times been so united, but what were the terms of this unity?
1. Above all, the war was portrayed as a patriotic war of national resistance.
2. No less important was the idea that this was a war in defense of home and family.
3. The enemy was portrayed as the personification of evil.

C. The government also took practical measures to strengthen popular support of the war effort:
1. The Church was rehabilitated.
2. Peasants were given greater freedom to sell produce grown on their private plots.

D. Nazi behavior during the war also encouraged patriotic unity.
1. When the German invasion began, some Soviet citizens, especially on the Western border lands, welcomed the Germans as liberators, but they were soon disappointed.
2. Instead of liberating peasants from collective farms, the Nazis used the *kolkhozy* for their own purposes.
3. They deported nearly three million civilians to camps in Germany.
4. Millions of Jews, gypsies, and Communists were executed or sent to German death camps.
5. Partisans were tortured, and whole villages were punished for helping the partisans.
6. These policies were consistent with Nazi thinking about Russia and Russians.

E. Ultimately, popular determination to resist the Nazis was a decisive element in Soviet victory.
1. In the long run, this did more to bolster the legitimacy and popularity of the Soviet regime than anything before.
2. But the mobilization of popular support also raised expectations about changed political and social relationships after the war.

Essential Reading:

Alexander Werth, *Russia at War, 1941–1945*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1999).

Supplementary Reading:

John Barber and Mark Harrison, *The Soviet Home Front, 1941–1945: A Social and Economic History of the USSR in World War II* (London, 1991).

John Erickson, *The Road to Stalingrad: Stalin's War with Germany* (New York, 1975).

———, *The Road to Berlin* (Boulder, 1983).

David Glantz and Jonathan House, *When Titans Clashed: How the Red Army Stopped Hitler* (Lawrence, 1988).

Ronald G. Suny, *The Structure of Russian History: Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 2003), chapter 5.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Questions to Consider:

1. Why did the Soviet army perform so poorly at the start of the war when war was so long expected?
2. What was the meaning of the war to ordinary Soviet citizens?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-Four
The Soviet Union after Stalin

Scope: This lecture looks at politics and the experiences of the Soviet people during the decades after the war and before Gorbachev's reforms. We examine people's expectations of a more normal life and Stalin's return to the harsh order of the past, including lack of attention to consumer needs, harsh xenophobia, and cultural repressiveness. The lecture then focuses on the policies of Stalin's successors, in particular, the long years of rule by Leonid Brezhnev. It considers the nurturing of loyal elites through various privileges but also the important efforts to create a welfare state that promised rising standards of living for the majority. To understand Soviet society at the level of everyday experience, the lecture then looks at important changes in social life, especially education and property holding, and people's growing connections to the larger world.

Outline

I. At the end of the war, most Soviet people, relieved and proud that they had been victorious, anticipated that a better and more "relaxed" life would be their reward.

- **A.** Instead, in the name of rebuilding their devastated country, the harsh order of the past returned.
  - **1.** Collectivization was strengthened.
  - **2.** Investment was focused on heavy industry, causing a shortage of consumer goods, including housing.
  - **3.** Cultural and intellectual life was again severely restricted, and writers or intellectuals who refused to conform were viciously condemned in public.
  - **4.** Relations with the West again became tense, such that a Cold War developed.
- **B.** Like the war itself, the Cold War was not simply a fact of international relations—it affected every aspect of culture and politics.
  - **1.** There was a massive upsurge in officially promoted nationalism (even xenophobia), and everything foreign was condemned.
  - **2.** By contrast, everything Russian was praised.
- **C.** To cap off these regressive tendencies, it appeared that a new purge was coming.
  - **1.** In January 1953, a number of Kremlin doctors (mainly Jews) were arrested for conspiring to murder the country's leaders.
  - **2.** Many saw this as the first step in a new terror against suspected enemies.
  - **3.** Only Stalin's death on March 5, 1953, may have prevented this from occurring.

II. Stalin's successors recognized that they could not continue to rule as Stalin had—more attention needed to be paid to people's desire for a more "normal life."

- **A.** Nikita Khrushchev (who headed the party from 1953–1964) began the reforms.
  - **1.** He initiated de-Stalinization, an open critique of Stalin's repression.
  - **2.** He made a significant effort to stimulate the consumer economy.
- **B.** Leonid Brezhnev's long rule (1964–1982) officially became known as "developed socialism."
  - **1.** In practice, it created a welfare state.
  - **2.** But the party also jealously guarded its power.
- **C.** During his brief time in office, Iurii Andropov (1982–1984) attempted to revitalize the stagnating economy.
- **D.** The seriously ailing Konstantin Chernenko, during his even briefer time in office (1984–1985), accomplished little.
- **E.** As the sense of crisis grew, Mikhail Gorbachev was chosen as party leader.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

III. A larger view of post-Stalinist Soviet life, particularly during the long period when Brezhnev was in power, will help us understand post-Stalin ideas and arrangements with respect to power, as well as why and how the system was heading toward radical reform, followed by collapse.

A. A key starting point is the state's relationship with its own elites, for which the Brezhnev regime took as its motto the phrase "trust in cadres."

1. In practice, this meant that officials were assured of greater job security than ever before in Soviet times.

2. The clearest evidence of this new security was the dramatic aging of the leadership.

B. "Trust in cadres" also meant catering to their interests, particularly their personal interests, which included providing them with all sorts of privileges.

1. Although few ordinary Russians were able to buy cars, the elite were given special access to limited supplies.

2. There were special stores at which only members of the elite could shop.

3. The ability to travel abroad was another privilege of status.

4. Elite status also meant better medical care.

5. Housing was also a perquisite of rank and service.

6. These numerous privileges did much to create a loyal managerial class, which proved to be one of the keys to the system's stability.

C. To encourage ordinary citizens to accept the legitimacy of the status quo, a form of social contract was established (one might call it a socialist welfare state) between the government and the population.

1. People were offered opportunities for upward mobility, a chance to become part of the elite.

2. Repression was kept within clearly defined and predictable bounds.

3. Free medical care was guaranteed for all citizens.

4. Unemployment was virtually nonexistent.

5. Everyone received a state pension at retirement.

6. Rents were subsidized and cheap, although housing was often substandard and crowded.

7. Food (especially bread and dairy products) was also subsidized.

8. Major investments were made in the consumer economy.

D. Although warning signs were visible, the standard of living rose throughout most of the 1960s and 1970s.

1. Wages and salaries increased (and there was little inflation to cut into these).

2. Food supplies improved.

3. The amount and variety of consumer goods increased.

4. New housing continued to be built.

E. What formal economic channels could not handle could often be found in the "second economy" (the "black market" or "unofficial economy").

1. Here, one could find foreign products, illegally manufactured goods, scarce Soviet goods, and services from moonlighters.

2. In the late Brezhnev years, the black market was estimated at 25 percent of the gross national product.

IV. To understand what all of this meant at the level of everyday human experience, we need to examine how people experienced all this and how they expressed their needs and values.

A. This is important as part of the cause (perhaps the main reason) for the collapse of communism in Russia and the Soviet Union, because the crisis was especially about attitudes that produced growing alienation from the Soviet system.

B. These changes in thinking derived from tangible changes in people's lives.

1. Starting in the mid-1960s, Soviet society became an urban society—city life tends to undermine traditional ways of thinking and encourage an appreciation of freedom and choice.

2. No less important was the fact that the USSR became a more educated society. A product of both urbanization and education was the growth of a large educated middle class of office workers, professionals, and specialists of all sorts.

3. A dramatic increase in small private property was allowed and even encouraged by the government, though expectations greatly exceeded realities.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

4. Exposure to new ideas and images through books, film, television, contact with Westerners, and some travel abroad led to an increasing awareness of the larger world.

C. All these conditions nurtured growing expectations and discontent.

Essential Reading:

Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (New York, 1985).

Supplementary Reading:

George Breslauer, *Khrushchev and Brezhnev as Leaders* (London, 1982).

James Millar, ed., *Politics, Work, and Daily Life in the USSR* (New York, 1987).

Ronald G. Suny, *The Structure of Russian History: Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 2003), part IV.

Questions to Consider:

1. What was the meaning of Brezhnev's motto "trust in cadres"? Was this an effective means of building an effective state authority or was it counterproductive corruption?
2. Do you agree with the characterization of post-Stalinist Soviet society as a "welfare state"?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-Five
Private and Public Dissidence

Scope: This lecture looks at alienation from and resistance to the Soviet system during the years before Gorbachev came to power. After considering widespread everyday conformity to the system, the lecture explores the many everyday ways that large numbers of people did not conform. The lecture looks at forms of subtle everyday defiance, the widespread withdrawal from public life, the development of alternative youth cultures, and various informal organizations. It also highlights popular literature and nonconformist art as exemplifying cultural trends of the time. The lecture next looks at the dissident movement, especially as expressed in *samizdat* and in the formation of dissident groups. We consider differing ideologies and the underlying values that united them.

Outline

I. Throughout Soviet life in the years after Stalin and before the Gorbachev reforms, one sees a great deal of what might be called "everyday dissidence."

- **A.** Most Soviet citizens were generally obedient and conformist and even supported the status quo.
  - **1.** Most read official papers and attended required political meetings.
  - **2.** Many cooperated with the KGB and even sought to join the party.
- **B.** However, large numbers of people did signal a measure of dissent through various forms of nonconformity.
- **C.** People dissented in scores of tiny but meaningful ways, gestures of defiance that made their lives more tolerable by them giving moments of control.
  - **1.** Although they attended the required meetings, they would knit, read the paper, talk, even play chess.
  - **2.** Although they read the official papers, they started at the back, with the sports section, the television listings, or articles about culture.
  - **3.** Although they worked, they came to work late and worked haphazardly.
- **D.** A larger trend in Soviet everyday life was the withdrawal from public into private life.
  - **1.** For example, during leisure time, people focused on such activities as sports, rather than politics.
  - **2.** Most important, though, was an increasing focus of energy and values on family and friends.
- **E.** A related sign of the cultural change that was undermining the status quo can be found in the everyday cultural lives of young people.
  - **1.** The Soviet press was filled with articles lamenting the lack of good Soviet consciousness among young people.
  - **2.** Dress, which emulated Western styles, was seen as emblematic of the problem.
- **F.** Another visible sign of a changing culture was the appearance of graffiti, which articulated alternative identities.
  - **1.** Some graffiti signaled identification with sports clubs.
  - **2.** By the early 1980s, much of the graffiti identified rock bands.
  - **3.** Some graffiti identified countercultural or even vaguely political groups, ranging from hippies to neo-fascists.

II. More direct, engaged, and even public expressions of dissident values also began appearing.

- **A.** The expanding private sphere of extended and interlinking circles of friends was a starting point for many of these dissident groupings.
  - **1.** A wide variety of religious circles arose.
  - **2.** Private cultural gatherings to discuss ideas and listen to poems and songs that could not be heard in public took place at individual apartments.
  - **3.** Certain singers, songwriters, and poets, such as Vladimir Vysotskii or Bulat Okudzhava, were popular because they expressed what most mattered in life: honesty and truth, human suffering and endurance, friendship and love.
- **B.** Another revealing trend was the nonofficial art of the time.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

1. Some of this art was nonconformist in subject and mood.
2. Some of it was philosophically inclined toward existential doubts and religion.
3. Much of this art asked big questions about life's meaning.
4. This art was also deeply ironic.

C. Another way to explore these trends is to look at popular tastes in reading.
1. Stories about individuals and their families and friends were most pervasive.
2. Equally telling is the lack of interest in tales about workers fulfilling the plan or Communist revolutionaries.

D. Certain themes were especially popular.
1. Stories about the war were widely read, as in the novels of Iurii Bondarev.
2. Escapist adventure, as well as a sense of justice, made crime and detective novels appealing, such as those of Iulian Semenov.
3. Spy novels served similar functions, often with an added nationalistic element.
4. Science fiction was another popular genre, though it often expressed a rather dark view of the effects of technology.
5. Stories about rural life ("village prose"), such as the novels and stories of Valentin Rasputin, which emphasized natural values and simplicity, were also popular.

E. Certain salient cultural patterns emerge from these thematic choices.
1. There was a widespread desire to escape from the ever-present official ideology.
2. There was also a need to seek out the spiritual or existential meaning in life.

III. The face of Soviet dissidence that was best known was the underground dissident movement.

A. The tactics of this movement were diverse and ranged from publishing forbidden works in *samizdat*, to circulating petitions against the repressive acts of the state, to organizing or participating in demonstrations.

B. The ideas and values of this movement were even more diverse.
1. From the late 1960s to the early 1980s, various dissident groups formed.
2. Most of these groups protested the denial of rights to a particular group, such as feminists, Protestants, Jews, national minorities, or workers.

C. Certain ideological tendencies can be seen.
1. The smallest group was the Marxist dissidents, the "true" Leninists, who complained that Stalin had crushed the democratic socialist spirit. A leading advocate of this point of view was Roy Medvedev.
2. The aim of another group, which some have called "neo-Slavophiles," was to return Russia to the traditions of its national culture and to rid Russia of alien Communism. Alexander Solzhenitsyn was a principle voice.
3. Most dissidents, however, shared a liberal-democratic and reformist perspective that aimed to force Communism to live up to its own democratic and humanitarian claims. Andrei Sakharov, the famous physicist, was the most well known spokesman of this point of view.

D. These ideological distinctions do not explain what inspired dissenters to put their personal lives at risk to serve a cause and to cooperate with one another.
1. All of them shared the ideal of "human rights," of the "rights of man."
2. No less important was something even more subtle, a desire to live for "truth" above all, to live as if they were free.
3. Of course, they were not really free—state repression often harassed these groups and individuals.

E. In many respects, these dissidents had much in common with earlier generations of the Russian intelligentsia.

F. Some Russian leaders recognized that much of the population was becoming visibly disenchanted with the established order.
1. This recognition is noticeable in the works of many Soviet sociologists and psychologists.
2. After 1985, the new party leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, spoke openly of a *dukhovny krizis* (spiritual or cultural crisis) in Russia—a crisis of values, judgments, beliefs, and sentiment.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Essential Reading:

David Shipler, *Russia: Broken Idols, Solemn Dreams* (New York, 1983).

Supplementary Reading:

Ludmilla Alexeyeva, *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious and Human Rights* (Middletown, 1985).

Peter Reddaway, ed., *Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1972).

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Matryona's Home," in Patricia Blake and Max Hayward, eds., *Half-way to the Moon* (New York, 1964).

Andrei Sakharov, *Sakharov Speaks* (New York, 1974).

Questions to Consider:

1. In what sense was there a growing "spiritual crisis," as Gorbachev called it, in Russian society in the years after Stalin? Were nonconformist attitudes a sign of the failure of the Soviet system or of its growing normalization?
2. Was there a consistent set of core ideas and values visible in all of this public and private dissidence?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Lecture Thirty-Six

Mikhail Gorbachev—*Perestroika* and *Glasnost'*

Scope: This series of lectures concludes by looking at Mikhail Gorbachev's recognition of the many problems of the system and his efforts to make Communism work. It considers the policies of *perestroika* in economics and politics and of *glasnost'* in civic and cultural life. The focus is on Gorbachev and his ideas. The lecture begins by looking at his true belief in the possibilities of socialism. To understand what socialism meant to Gorbachev, the lecture examines three key ideas. First, it looks at his notions of democracy as both free and orderly. Next, the lecture examines his notion of authority. Like many previous reformers, we see that Gorbachev believed in the necessity of strong leadership and power to ensure reform. Third, the lecture explores his preoccupations with moral order for both politics and society. Finally, the lecture asks why Gorbachev failed and concludes with a consideration of the situation left in the wake of the collapse of Communism.

Outline

I. In March 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev was made head of the Communist Party, with a mandate to address the approaching economic and social crisis in the system.

- **A.** His first step was to admit the problems publicly.
  - **1.** For the first time, the government and party spoke openly and honestly of slowing economic growth ("stagnation").
  - **2.** Leaders also admitted widespread alienation and withdrawal—a cultural-ideological crisis.
- **B.** Gorbachev's solution was two-pronged.
  - **1.** The first part of the solution was political and economic restructuring (*perestroika*).
  - **2.** The second was openness in civic discussions of both the past and the present (*glasnost'*).
- **C.** Gorbachev's reforms encouraged a loosening of bonds everywhere.
  - **1.** People began to speak openly about problems and solutions, including the need for a more democratic and market-oriented system.
  - **2.** In Eastern Europe, a wave of popular revolutions swept Communists out of power.
  - **3.** In 1990–1991, the Baltic States and Georgia demanded independence from the USSR, and Boris Yeltsin was elected President of the Russian Republic.
  - **4.** Conservative Communists arrested Gorbachev and seized power.
  - **5.** Resistance to the coup led to its failure within days, along with the collapse of Communist rule and the USSR.
- **D.** Understanding these events requires understanding what Mikhail Gorbachev was seeking to accomplish.
  - **1.** Gorbachev was a characteristic "true believer."
  - **2.** He so believed in his country's official version of itself—the ideal of socialism—that he could not bear the wide discrepancy between ideals and reality.
  - **3.** This was the source of both his reforming zeal and his unwillingness to let reform go too far.

II. To understand Gorbachev's conception of socialism—in its ideal form and potential—one must begin with his notion of democracy.

- **A.** It was the official claim of the Soviet system that it was more democratic than any other.
  - **1.** Gorbachev was the first Soviet leader since the 1920s to admit that the practices of Soviet socialism were far from democratic.
  - **2.** But he wanted this dream to come true.
- **B.** We see this in his speeches, which were filled with talk about the democratic nature of socialism and appeals for more popular involvement and initiative.
- **C.** When Gorbachev talked about "democracy" and popular participation, he used these ideas in a distinctive way.
  - **1.** For Gorbachev, real democracy meant orderly and responsible public participation.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

2. He constantly lectured people about the need to ground freedom in "civic responsibility" and to preserve "law and order" (*pravoporiadok*).
3. During his last year in power, his appeals for reason, order, and responsibility became especially pervasive, especially in his criticisms of Boris Yeltsin, of "so-called democrats," and of right-wing nationalists.

III. Gorbachev's arguments also reflected his belief in the necessity of strong central authority in times of change.

A. Throughout his career, he spoke of the important role that the party played in Soviet history and Soviet life.
1. After *perestroika* was underway, Gorbachev continually insisted on the need for a "strong political party" to unite the country and guide change.
2. By early 1991, as the Communist Party proved rigid and resistant to change, he began to shift attention from the party to the centralized state.

B. Gorbachev insisted on the necessity not only of strong power, but also of civilized power.
1. Gorbachev was obsessed with the problem of leadership quality.
2. Even before he came to power, Gorbachev regularly criticized the inadequacies of local leadership.
3. By the early 1980s, his critique became more encompassing, criticizing officials for such failings as formalism, procrastination (*volokita*), inertia, and self-satisfaction.
4. After he came to power, he launched a major campaign against these evils.

IV. Central to Gorbachev's ideas about both democracy and authority was a striking moralism.

A. Since the mid-1970s, Gorbachev had been preaching a high moral code.
1. While party leader in Stavropol, he frequently called on people to struggle against indiscipline, acquisitiveness, theft, bribe-taking, and drunkenness.
2. In the early 1980s, he intensified his appeals, demanding intolerance of such moral weaknesses as social passivity, parasitism, and moral nihilism.

B. Once in power, these arguments reached a fever pitch.
1. He launched a massive campaign against drunkenness.
2. Another campaign sought to instill work discipline.
3. He also fought against pornography, prostitution, and "mass culture."
4. His lists of condemned moral failings continued to grow, including arrogance, boorishness, consumerism, materialism, and philistine vulgarity (*poshlost'*).

C. Gorbachev's first uses of the term *perestroika* in the early-1980s involved what he called "*perestroika* of consciousness" and "*perestroika* of spiritual life."

D. How are we to interpret this moral preaching?
1. Partly, it sprang from practical considerations—the social and economic costs of indiscipline and the need for effective leaders.
2. No less, ethics and morality went to the heart of Gorbachev's ideals about socialism.
3. For Gorbachev, socialism must be a variety of "humanism" that promotes the fullest development and dignity of the "human person" (*lichnost'*).

V. Why did Gorbachev fail to create a viable humanistic, socialist society?

A. In part, his failure was practical: The economy remained stagnant.

B. But most of all, he failed because too few people shared his vision of socialism.
1. Tradition-minded Communists viewed his ideas as undermining power and order.
2. More liberal-minded citizens lacked his attachment to socialism and insisted on greater change.

C. The dramatic collapse of Communism did not immediately solve Russia's problems.
1. While freedom flourished, social order disintegrated.
2. Although conditions have improved in recent years, most Russians are still far from living the "normal life" they crave.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Essential Reading:

Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World* (New York, 1987).

Supplementary Reading:

Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford, 1997).

George Breslauer, *Gorbachev and Yeltsin as Leaders* (Cambridge, England, 2002).

Stephen Kotkin, *Armageddon Averted: The Soviet Collapse, 1970–2000* (Oxford, 2001).

Michael McFaul, *Russia's Unfinished Revolution: Political Change from Gorbachev to Putin* (Ithaca, 2001).

Nancy Ries, *Russia Talk: Culture and Conversation during Perestroika* (Ithaca, 1997).

Questions to Consider:

1. Was Gorbachev's vision of a reformed and humanistic socialism unrealizable?
2. How do you explain the central role of morality in Gorbachev's vision of reform, given that Marxism traditionally rejected the notion of universal values existing apart from the interests of social classes?

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Bibliography

Essential Reading:

John Alexander, *Catherine the Great: Life and Legend* (New York, 1989). A very readable introduction to Catherine's life and reputation.

———, *Emperor of the Cossacks: Pugachov and the Frontier Jacquerie of 1773–1775* (Lawrence, 1973). The only major English-language study of this remarkable revolt.

Abraham Ascher, *The Russian Revolution of 1905*, 2 volumes (Stanford, 1988 and 1992). The best overview of this first major social revolution, based on careful and thorough scholarship and balanced interpretations.

Paul Avrich, *Russian Rebels, 1600–1800* (New York, 1972). An insightful series of sympathetic essays on the Pugachev uprising and earlier peasant rebellions in Russian history.

Isaiah Berlin, *Russian Thinkers* (New York, 1995—or earlier editions). A series of brilliant and accessible essays on Herzen, Belinskii, Tolstoy, and others by an eminent British scholar and essayist.

Stephen Cohen, *Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution* (Oxford, 1980). Though written before the opening of the archives, an insightful and even eloquent biography of Bukharin and his times.

Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed, The Prophet Unarmed, The Prophet Outcast* (any edition). Although written many years ago and often too sympathetic to Trotsky, this three-volume biography remains one of the most compelling stories of a Russian revolutionary.

Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (Harmondsworth, 1996). An important interpretive history of the origins and consequences of the revolution, written with passion and with sympathy for ordinary Russians.

———, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* (New York, 2002). Three centuries of Russian cultural history told through compelling individual stories.

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism* (Oxford, 1999). A pioneering account of everyday life under Stalin, focusing on urban life, by an eminent and influential historian.

Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1994). A collection of articles on the everyday lives, cultural outlooks, and forms of protest among urban workers, peasants, and other common people.

Gregory Freeze, ed., *Russia: A History* (Oxford, 1997). A new survey history of Russia composed of essays by leading scholars.

Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World* (New York, 1987). Gorbachev's own attempt to explain to a Western audience the meaning of his reforms.

Camilla Grey, *The Russian Experiment in Art, 1863–1922* (London, 1986). A fascinating introduction to modern artistic movements in Russia.

Geoffrey Hosking, *The First Socialist Society: A History of the Soviet Union from Within* (Cambridge, MA, 1993). An excellent introduction to Soviet history, with a strong emphasis on society and human experience, by a leading British historian.

Lindsey Hughes, *Peter the Great: A Biography* (New Haven, 2002). The best biography of Peter the Great, by a leading scholar of the era, exploring Peter's complex character, his relationships with many individuals of his time, and his image in the eyes of others.

Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley, 1995). An important and original study of Stalin's industrial and social revolution from above from the perspective of one of the greatest projects of these years, the city of Magnitogorsk.

Dominic Lieven, *Nicholas II* (New York, 1994). An intelligent and fair introduction to the life of Russia's last tsar, focusing on politics.

W. Bruce Lincoln, *Between Heaven and Hell: The Story of a Thousand Years of Artistic Life in Russia* (New York, 1998). A sweeping and readable introduction to the whole of Russia's artistic life, by a respected historian. Like most of Lincoln's books, written for general readers.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

———, *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, 1990). An excellent introduction to Alexander II's great reforms, focusing on political and social policy and change.

———, *Passage through Armageddon: The Russians in War and Revolution, 1914–1918* (New York, 1986). One of the best general accounts of Russia during the first world war.

Isabel de Madariaga, *Catherine the Great: A Short History* (New Haven, 1990). A condensed version, organized thematically, of Madariaga's longer study of Catherine and her age, widely considered the best study of Catherine's reign.

Anatole Mazour, *The First Russian Revolution, 1825* (Stanford, 1964). Still the best history of the Decembrist rebellion, if rather dry.

Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (New York: Penguin, 1997). An important if controversial interpretation of the evolution of Russia from earliest times to the formation of an authoritarian state and society by the 1880s.

Alexander Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin and Other Poems (Everyman's Library Pocket Poets)* (New York, 1999).

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (Oxford, 2000). Widely considered the most fair, reliable, and comprehensive history of Russia.

———, *The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought* (New York, 1985). A fascinating exploration of what others said about Peter from his own time into the Soviet period and what this reveals about how Russians thought about politics, their relation to the West and to their own past, and much else.

Hans Rogger, *Russia in the Age of Modernization and Revolution, 1881–1917* (London and New York, 1983). A densely written but superb introduction to these critical final years of the Russian empire.

Robert Service, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge, 2000). The best biography of Lenin, this is a condensed version of his more detailed three-volume study.

David Shipler, *Russia: Broken Idols, Solemn Dreams* (New York, 1983). An insightful and moving account of Soviet lives and individuals in the early 1980s by the *New York Times* bureau chief.

Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (New York, 1985). A revised edition of this excellent and fascinating journalistic account of life in Brezhnev's Russia by an earlier *New York Times* bureau chief.

Mark Steinberg, *Voices of Revolution, 1917* (New Haven, 2001). A book that combines introductory essays on the history of the revolution based on the most recent scholarship, a discussion of popular attitudes about the revolution, and full texts of translated letters, appeals, and other writings by lower-class Russians.

Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (Oxford, 1985). A fascinating account of the visionary dimensions of the Soviet experiment and their suppression in the 1930s.

Ronald G. Suny, *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the Soviet Union, and the Successor States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Victor Terras, *A History of Russian Literature* (New Haven, 1991). Though a bit dry, because it is written as a textbook, this is the best introduction to a wide variety of Russian writers and the cultural contexts in which they worked.

Olga Semyonova Tian-Shanskaia, *Village Life in Late Tsarist Russia* (Bloomington, 1993). The translation of a unique firsthand portrait of peasant life in pre-revolutionary Russia, written by a noted ethnographer.

Henri Troyat, *Tolstoy* (New York, 1967). A dramatic account of Tolstoy's life that itself reads like a sweeping epic novel.

Robert Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879–1929* (New York, 1973) and *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from Above, 1928–1941* (New York, 1992). The best overall history of Stalin as man and ruler, emphasizing Stalin's personality and his authoritarian politics.

Franco Venturi, *The Roots of Revolution* (London, 2001). A reprint of a classic history of Russian populist socialism, from Herzen to the terrorists of the People's Will.

Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford, 1979). A sophisticated introduction to the history of Russian political, social, and philosophical thought from the time of Catherine II to the 1905 revolution.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Alexander Werth, *Russia at War, 1941–1945*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1999). A widely acclaimed history and eyewitness account of the Soviet Union in World War II, focusing on both the military history and on the human stories that made the war such a traumatic and compelling time. Werth has been justly criticized for being not sufficiently critical of Stalin.

Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in the Russian Monarchy*, 2 volumes (Princeton, 1995 and 2000). A brilliant account of the whole history of monarchy in Russia from the perspective of ritual and legitimating myth and what these tell us about the ideology of power in Russia.

Supplementary Reading:

Ludmilla Alexeyeva, *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious and Human Rights* (Middletown, 1985). A survey of the variety of Soviet dissident movements.

John Barber and Mark Harrison, *The Soviet Home Front, 1941–1945: A Social and Economic History of the USSR in World War II* (London, 1991).

David Bethea, *Realizing Metaphors: Alexander Pushkin and the Life of the Poet* (Madison, 1998).

George Breslauer, *Gorbachev and Yeltsin as Leaders* (Cambridge, England, 2002) and *Khrushchev and Brezhnev as Leaders* (London, 1982). A probing analysis of leadership styles and political roles by a political scientist.

Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford, 1997).

Jeffrey Burds, *Peasant Dreams and Market Politics: Labor Migration and the Russian Village, 1861–1905* (Pittsburgh, 1998).

Paul Bushkovitch, *Peter the Great* (Oxford, 2001). A concise and tightly argued study of Peter the Great's domestic reforms, especially his struggle with the conservative aristocratic opposition.

Robert Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought* (Bloomington, 1968).

Michael Cherniavsky, "Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Medieval Political Theory," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20 (1959): 459–476.

Nikolai Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?* (Ithaca, 1989). Perhaps the most influential text written in Russia in the nineteenth century, this novel, written in prison in 1862, offers a fascinating window into the utopian ideals of Russia's radical intellectuals.

Edith Clowes et al., eds., *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1991). An important collection of essays by scholars exploring different aspects of the rise of a public sphere, especially among educated middle-class Russians.

Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (Oxford, 1991). A searing critical account, filled with detailed stories, of Stalin's terror.

R. W. Davies, *The Industrialization of Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, 1979), 2 volumes.

———, *The Socialist Offensive: The Collectivization of Soviet Agriculture*, *1929–30* (Cambridge, 1980).

James Edie, James Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, *Russian Philosophy* (Chicago, 1965).

Ben Eklof, John Bushnell, and Larissa Zakharova, eds., *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855–1881* (Bloomington, 1994).

Barbara Alpern Engel, *Between the Fields and the City: Women, Work, and Family in Russia, 1861–1914* (Cambridge, England, 1995). A fascinating social history of the experiences of the impact of industry and urban life on village women, whether or not they migrated to work in industry.

Barbara Alpern Engel and Clifford Rosenthal, *Five Sisters: Women against the Tsar* (Boston, 1987).

Laura Engelstein, *Moscow, 1905* (Stanford, 1982).

John Erickson, *The Road to Stalingrad: Stalin's War with Germany* (New York, 1975) and *The Road to Berlin* (Boulder, 1983). The best scholarly history of the Soviet role in World War II.

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Stalin's Peasants: Resistance and Survival in the Russian Village after Collectivization* (Oxford, 1994). A pioneering social history of the Soviet countryside after collectivism, which reveals much about the texture of everyday life in the countryside and the structures of conformity and resistance.

———, *The Cultural Front: Power and Culture in Revolutionary Russia* (Ithaca, 1992).

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

———, ed., *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928–1931* (Bloomington, 1978). An influential collection of scholarly essays that explore upheavals in the professions during Stalin's first five-year plan. A revisionist work that focuses on the complex social history of the Stalinist revolution.

Sheila Fitzpatrick, Alexander Rabinowitch, and Richard Stites, eds., *Russia in the Era of NEP* (Bloomington, 1991). A superb collection of scholarly essays on varied aspects of the NEP era, especially social and cultural.

Stephen Frank, *Crime, Cultural Conflict, and Justice in Rural Russia, 1856–1914* (Berkeley, 1999). A deeply researched study of the unknown world of crime and justice in rural Russia and what this reveals about peasant life and culture and peasant relations with the state and social elites.

J. Arch Getty and Roberta Manning, eds., *Stalinist Terror* (Cambridge, England, 1993).

Israel Getzler, *Martov: A Political Biography of a Russian Social Democrat* (Cambridge, England, 1967).

David Glantz and Jonathan House, *When Titans Clashed: How the Red Army Stopped Hitler* (Lawrence, 1988).

Abbott Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (New York, 1980).

Leopold Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism* (Boston, 1955). A fascinating study of the personalities and ideologies of the leading Marxists—Lenin, Plekhanov, Akselrod, and Martov—who most shaped Marxism in Russia and the split between Bolshevism and Menshevism.

Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917* (Seattle, 1981).

Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts* (Berkeley, 1999). An extraordinary, brilliantly written firsthand account of Russian life, his own experiences, and the rise of the early nineteenth-century intelligentsia by one of its leaders. It has often been described as one of the greatest autobiographies ever written.

Steven Hoch, *Serfdom and Social Control in Russia* (Chicago, 1986). The best account of life on a serf estate in the nineteenth century.

Lindsey Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great* (New Haven, 1998). The most important study of Peter the Great, one that views Peter's policies in the context of his times.

W. Gareth Jones, *Nikolay Novikov: Enlightener of Russia* (Cambridge, 1984).

Donald H. Kaiser, ed., *The Workers Revolution in Russia, 1917* (Cambridge, England, 1987).

Daniel Kaiser and Gary Marker, eds., *Reinterpreting Russian History: Readings, 860s–1860s* (York, 1994). An excellent selection of original documents and interpretive writings covering state structure, economy, society, and daily life in Russia.

Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd, eds., *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution, 1881–1940* (Oxford, 1998). An innovative and insightful collection of collaboratively written essays by historians and literary scholars on aspects of Russian and Soviet cultural life, ranging from consumerism to art and literature.

George Kline, *Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia* (Chicago, 1968). Still the best account of various religious movements in imperial Russia, including God-seeking and God-building.

Vasili Kliuchevsky, *Peter the Great* (New York, 1958).

Diane Koenker, William Rosenberg, and Ronald Suny, eds., *Party, State, and Society in the Russian Civil War* (Bloomington, 1989). An excellent collection of scholarly articles on the civil war era, offering new interpretations on politics and society.

Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge, MA, 1987). A fascinating comparison of the social lives and forms of resistance by American slaves and Russian serfs in the early nineteenth century.

Stephen Kotkin, *Armageddon Averted: The Soviet Collapse, 1970–2000* (Oxford, 2001). An interpretation of the end of Communism, focusing on the unintended consequences and ironies of reformist efforts.

Peter Lavrov, *Historical Letters* (Berkeley, 1967).

Moshe Lewin, *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power*: *A Study of Collectivization* (New York, 1968).

W. Bruce Lincoln, *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats, 1825–1861* (DeKalb, 1986). An important study of often-neglected tsarist officials: the enlightened officials who helped shape the great reforms.

Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, 1981). A masterly study of Catherine and her reign.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Vladimir Markov, *Russian Futurism: A History* (Berkeley, 1968).

Evan Mawdsley, *The Russian Civil War* (Boston, 1987).

Allen McConnell, *Tsar Alexander I: Paternalistic Reformer* (New York, 1970).

Michael McFaul, *Russia's Unfinished Revolution: Political Change from Gorbachev to Putin* (Ithaca, 2001). An important account and interpretation of the efforts to create a democratic policy and society in Russia, beginning with Gorbachev's reforms.

James Millar, ed., *Politics, Work, and Daily Life in the USSR* (New York, 1987).

Nikolai Novikov, "On Man's High Estate," in *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology* (New York, 1966).

Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior* (Stanford, 1988).

Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1990). An important interpretive history of the origins and consequences of the revolution, written from a highly critical perspective.

Konstantin Pobedonostsev, *Reflections of a Russian Statesman* (Ann Arbor, 1965).

Philip Pomper, *The Russian Revolutionary Intelligentsia* (Arlington Heights, IL, 1970).

Alexander Rabinowitch, *The Bolsheviks Come to Power* (New York, 1976). A very important account of the Bolshevik revolution that focuses on the party and its success in building a constituency and responding to conditions.

Marc Raeff, *Catherine the Great: A Profile* (New York, 1972).

———, *The Decembrist Movement* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966). An excellent selection of documents with an insightful introductory essay by one of the best historians of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

———, *The Origins of the Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York, 1966). A brilliant and fascinating account of the changing world of the eighteenth-century Russian nobility, focusing on relations to the state, home life, education, and the impact of Western ideas.

Peter Reddaway, ed., *Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1972).

Christopher Read, *Religion, Revolution, and the Russian Intelligentsia* (Totowa, 1979).

Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley, 1959). The best study of Nicholas I, especially of the ideological ideas that inspired his policies.

———, *A Parting of the Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). An intelligent and thoughtful account of trends in political and social dissent in early nineteenth-century Russia.

Nancy Ries, *Russian Talk: Culture and Conversation during Perestroika* (Ithaca, 1997). A wonderful study by an American anthropologist, on the basis of field work in Moscow, exploring themes in everyday conversation and how these reflect and shape Russian identity and culture.

Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture* (Ithaca, 1997).

Andrei Sakharov, *Sakharov Speaks* (New York, 1974).

Lewis Siegelbaum, *Soviet State and Society between Revolutions, 1918–1929* (Cambridge, England, 1992). An excellent survey, based on recent research, of issues and themes in early Soviet political and social history.

Lewis Siegelbaum and Andrei Sokolov, eds., *Stalinism as a Way of Life* (New Haven, 2000).

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Matryona's Home," in Patricia Blake and Max Hayward, eds., *Half-way to the Moon* (New York, 1964).

Mark D. Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Ithaca, 2002). An unusual exploration of ideas and values in late-Imperial and early Soviet Russia through the prism of poetry and other writings by urban lower-class Russians.

Mark D. Steinberg and Vladimir Khrustalev, *The Fall of the Romanovs: Political Dreams and Personal Struggles in a Time of Revolution* (New Haven, 1995). A study and collection of documents on the last tsar from the revolution to his execution.

Ronald G. Suny, *The Structure of Russian History: Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 2003).

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership

Gerald Surh, *1905 in St. Petersburg* (Stanford, 1989).

Abram Terts (Andrei Sinyavsky), *Strolls with Pushkin* (New Haven, 1993).

William Mills Todd, III, *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin: Ideology, Institutions and Narrative* (Cambridge, MA, 1986).

Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Lenin Anthology* (New York, 1975). An essential collection of Lenin's most important writings.

George Vernadsky, Ralph Fisher, et al., eds., *A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917*, 3 volumes (New Haven, 1972). The best collection of translated original documents, organized chronologically and by topic.

Andrew Verner, *The Crisis of Russian Autocracy: Nicholas II and the 1905 Revolution* (Princeton, 1990). An insightful study of Nicholas II's personality and ideology, especially as visible during the crisis of 1905.

Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* (Oxford, 1975).

Cynthia Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (DeKalb, 1984).

Allan Wildman, *The End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 2 volumes (Princeton, 1980 and 1987). A magisterial study of soldiers and the army during the first world war and the 1917 revolution.

Christine Worobec, *Peasant Russia* (DeKalb, 1995). A pathbreaking study on peasant life in the decades immediately following emancipation, focusing on community, gender, and family.

Reginald Zelnik, ed., *A Radical Worker in Tsarist Russia: The Autobiography of Semen Ivanovich Kanatchikov* (Stanford, 1986). An exceptional autobiography, introduced by a leading historian of Russian labor, of a Bolshevik metal worker, describing his personal, social, and political transformations.

Web Sites:

http://www.departments.bucknell.edu/russian/history.html—*Russian History.* An extensive index by Robert Beard of Bucknell University, with many sites devoted to Russian history. Particularly recommended is the *Chronology of Russian History*, which includes many hypertext links.

http://www.pbs.org/weta/faceofrussia/—*The Face of Russia.* A Web site developed in connection with a PBS program on Russian history, which includes an interactive timeline and hundreds of images, movies, and audio tracks.

http://www.rollins.edu/Foreign_Lang/Russian/ruspaint.html—*Russian Painting*. A site covering the history of Russian art, with many visual examples and excellent short descriptions of periods and artists.

http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/lirsk/kunst.htm—*Lotman Institute for Russian and Soviet Culture.* A German site with an excellent collection of Russian and Soviet posters and portraits.

©2003 The Teaching Company Limited Partnership